

urging enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

548. Also, petition of Mrs. Sophie Rasmussen, of Milaca, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 22 residents of Hurlock, Md., favoring legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

550. Also, petition of 33 residents of Chestertown, Md., favoring legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York League of Business and Professional Women, Inc., New York, N. Y., requesting the expansion of personnel to guard all ports of entry into the United States, thereby safeguarding smuggling of narcotics into the country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. Also, petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. Also, petition of Victory Townsend Club No. 13, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

554. Also, petition of Three-Score-Ten Club of West Palm Beach, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

555. Also, petition of Fifth Congressional District Council of Townsend Clubs, Ormond, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in hours of exhausting strain which drain away our strength we give Thee thanks for the daily pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer. We are grateful for this white altar reared at the gates of the morning, which speaks to us ever of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual forces which alone abide and on which our salvation in the end depends.

In these fateful days of decision, which will mold the future, save us from staining our own honor in any attempt to purchase a spurious peace. Prosper, we beseech Thee, all sincere efforts of those who speak for the nations, that there may be found a more excellent way, when in sharing all Thy sundered children may gain all in the fairer earth that our hands may help to fashion. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 15, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 64. An act for the relief of Helen Dick;
S. 366. An act for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville;

S. 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Yau Shun Leung;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Francisca Quinones;

S. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Chai Chang Chai; and

S. 1909. An act for the relief of Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. ECTON, made on behalf of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Senate Appropriations Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the Record, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 356)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Annual Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1952.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of Public Law 32 of the Legislature of Guam, providing for the levy, assessment, equalization, and collection of a real-prop-

erty tax on land situated in the Territory of Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN PRACTICES OF AIR TRANSPORTATION TICKET AGENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CERTIFICATIONS OF COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES AT CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at certain public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore: A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide for repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for the adoption of the twenty-second amendment thereto, limiting the rates of taxes on incomes, gifts, inheritances, and estates to 25 percent

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a proposal to provide for repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend such Constitution by fixing a limitation on taxes thereafter levied on incomes, gifts, inheritances, and estates; and

"Whereas such a constitutional limitation is essential to the preservation of the American way of life after the war; and

"Whereas the legislatures of seven States of the United States have already by overwhelming action adopted such a resolution, and such action has never been defeated in any roll call in any legislature, and there is good reason to believe that such resolution will be adopted by the legislatures of the remaining States of the Union now in session; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Indiana are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of pro-

posing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE XXII

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Indiana Member thereof."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritance, and gifts

"Whereas the National Government, through the excessive use of the tax power, has greatly encroached upon the tax revenue sources of the several States; and

"Whereas the very existence of our dual system of government is dependent upon strong and economically sound State government; and

"Whereas the continued preemption of available tax sources by the Federal Government will seriously impair the tax structure of the several States thus tending to further centralize the government on a national basis: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That the Legislature of the State of Georgia respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from what-

ever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; provided that in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall not apply during hostilities while the United States is in a state of war declared by Congress and shall be subject to the further qualification that in the event of a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each house may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of Section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States, be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia.

"FRED HAND,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,

"Clerk of the House.
"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,

"Secretary of the Senate.
"Approved this 6th day of February 1952.
"HERMAN E. TALMADGE,

"Governor."

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that treaties made under the authority of the United States shall, along with the Constitution and Laws of the United States, be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and

"Whereas the treaty-making power is, with increasing frequency, being resorted to for the purpose of empowering Congress to enact, by way of implementing treaties, laws which Congress would otherwise be without power to enact; and

"Whereas the effect of this provision of the Constitution of the United States is to enable the President, with the consent of

two-thirds of the Senate, to change the Constitution of the United States and enlarge the powers of the Congress by conferring upon the Congress power to enact laws to implement and enforce such treaties; and

"Whereas the practice, if continued, could well result in complete destruction of the States and in gross invasions of the rights of the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas such a condition is extremely dangerous and undesirable: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That the Congress of the United States be hereby requested to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States relating to the treaty-making power and that it be amended in the following respects:

"1. To provide that a treaty shall not become the supreme law of the land upon ratification except to the extent that it shall thereafter be made so by act of Congress;

"2. To provide that in legislating to give effect to treaties Congress shall make no law not otherwise authorized by the Constitution; and

"3. To provide that the basic structure of the United States Government as now embodied in the Constitution, the express limitations of the Constitution on the powers of Congress, the guarantees of rights and freedoms contained in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and the powers reserved to the States and to the people, shall not be in anywise altered by any treaty or executive agreement nor otherwise than by constitutional amendment; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"FRED HAND,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Approved this 29th day of January 1952.
"HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
"Governor."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL on February 14, 1952, p. 973, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the enactment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL on February 14, 1952, p. 973, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The memorial of Mrs. M. Walsh, a citizen of the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by South Miami (Florida) Townsend Club No. 1, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the New York League of Business and Professional Women, Inc., New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate appropriations to guard against the smuggling of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

**CENSORSHIP AND RESTRAINT OF NEWS—
RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
WEEKLY PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
BOSTON, MASS.**

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Weekly Publishers Association, at Boston, Mass., relating to the censorship and restraint of news.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NEW HAMPSHIRE
WEEKLY PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL
MEETING, HOTEL KENMORE, BOSTON, MASS.,
JANUARY 18, 1952**

Whereas there is a growing tendency among the agencies of the Federal Government to censor or restrain such news of its activities as it deems unwise for public knowledge; and

Whereas this attitude has been strengthened by a recent Executive order by the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Weekly Publishers Association challenges this attitude as inimical to the public interest and an abrogation of the rights conveyed by the first amendment to the Constitution, and calls upon New Hampshire Representatives in the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to defeat this purpose.

**WHEAT PRODUCTS IN THE HUMAN DIET—
RESOLUTION**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the wheat growers and farmers of our Nation are concerned about the unwarranted attacks and propaganda detrimental to the use of wheat and wheat products and other valuable nutritive agricultural products in the diet of our citizens.

The publicity and sales promotion campaign on the part of certain proprietary health foods, seek, by the publication of unwarranted claims and statements to prejudice people against including in the diet food products made from wheat, and particularly bread, as well as other nutritive foods.

This publicity and sales promotion program is being carried on in newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, billboards and radio. Its nature reveals a disregard for truth and scientifically established and accepted facts respecting diet and nutrition, and in some instances even the ability of our soil to produce nutritious food crops.

Some of the material speaks in terms of ridicule and disrespect of our farmers who produce so abundantly the food crops upon which this country and many other people are dependent for food.

The Kansas State Board of Agriculture is taking an active part in this campaign.

At Topeka, Kans., on January 29, a large number of farm organizations and others interested in agriculture met for the purpose of determining a program

of refuting and counteracting these unwarranted attacks and propaganda detrimental to the consumption of these nutritive food products.

Among the organizations and agencies invited to attend the meeting were the following: the Kansas Farm Bureau, the Grange, Equity Union Grain Co., Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., Farmers Union, Farmers Union Jobbing Association, consumers, and other co-op organizations, Kansas Wheat Growers Association, Kansas Industrial Development Commission, Western Kansas Development Association, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Kansas Wheat Improvement Association, Kansas Wheat Quality Council, Kansas Crop Improvement Association, State board of health, chambers of commerce, Kansas Grain, Feed, and Seed Dealers Association, department heads of Kansas State College, Wheat Flour Institute, State and Federal agencies, representatives of the grain, milling, and baking industries.

I present for appropriate reference a resolution unanimously approved by these groups assembled at the meeting at Topeka on that date and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the assembled group approve an education program to call to the attention of the general public nutritional information concerning wheat products in the human diet.

Resolved, That we condemn and will continue to oppose the activities and kind of publicity employed by certain individuals and groups operating throughout the country, who in promoting the sale of various purported cure-alls, including proprietary health foods, seek, by the publication of unwarranted claims and statements, to prejudice people against including in the diet, food products made from wheat, particularly bread, as well as other nutritive foods.

Resolved, That we commend and compliment Mr. Charles W. Crawford, Commissioner of United States Food and Drug Administration, for the timely public statement he recently made, in which he warns the people to beware of the health food peddlers who mulct the public of millions through the sale of so-called health foods and diet supplements people do not need and would be better off without. We deplore the fact that other Government agencies supposedly having an interest and responsibility in such matters have not been as vigorously outspoken as Mr. Crawford; be it further

Resolved, That we object to the Senate Agricultural Committee or any other Government agency lending aid and comfort to the group of vendors mentioned herein, as happened in the case of Senate Report No. 604, August 1, 1951, supposedly reporting on utilization of farm crops, which report contains many misleading statements and unwarranted conclusions, harmful to agriculture and food processed from wheat. That report was entrusted to a subcommittee and following a protest to the chairman of the regular committee, it was admitted that too many Senators depend entirely too much on staff members for information rather than take the time to make a study of the facts at issue themselves.

Resolved, That copies of this report and resolution be released to the press, to our Representatives in Congress, the chairman

of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, to United States Department of Agriculture, to Mr. Charles W. Crawford, and any others deemed to have an interest in the subject matters of this resolution.

**ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS
AND LETTERS**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over my State of Wisconsin and the Midwest as a whole, I have received a large number of resolutions endorsing ratification of the Canadian-United States agreement on the St. Lawrence seaway. I ask unanimous consent that several such resolutions and letters be printed in the RECORD at this point and be thereafter referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the mayor and Council of the City of Green Bay—

Whereas the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River waterway has been up for consideration by the Congress of the United States throughout a period of many years without receiving favorable consideration; and

Whereas the city of Green Bay has had representation in the past at various congressional hearings held on the matter to make known Green Bay's endorsement of the project; and

Whereas Canada has made known to the United States that if this country does not wish to participate in a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway development with it, that Canada will proceed with its own development of the project; and

Whereas the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River project would add to the development of one of the principal natural resources of the country, that of access to ocean ports or harbors by making the entire midwest area readily accessible to ocean ports, with the additional benefit of greater industrial development; and

Whereas the project is one of vital necessity to the national safety in time of war due to its creating another accessway to ocean ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Green Bay does hereby go on record as favoring United States participation with Canada in the immediate development of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River waterway; be it further

Resolved, That responsible officials of the city of Green Bay be instructed to represent the city at such congressional hearings in Washington that are important to the furtherance of this project; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress, and the United States Senators from Wisconsin.

Whereas this community, in the knowledge that realization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project would be of the greatest economic and defense value to this Nation and inure to betterment of the Middle West as well as this State and municipality, has repeatedly gone on record favoring promotion of such facility; and

Whereas minority interests have been able to delay necessary approval and appropriations in the Congress of the United States despite an obvious economic justification for the waterway; and

Whereas the Canadian Government's announcement that it is considering going ahead on the development regardless of par-

ticipation by the United States foreshadows the possibility of this Nation defaulting on an issue going to the progress and stability of the entire country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., That by and through the adoption of this resolution, this body, representing the citizens of our community, again repeats the hope that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will find realization in fact and that this city stands ready to do what it can to assist in promoting such development; be it further

Resolved, That representative of the citizens of this community, we memorialize the Congress of the United States to seek early action on House Joint Resolution 337 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, relating to the seaway, which are resting in committees; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send certified copies hereof to the President and Vice President of the United States, to our Representatives in the Congress of the United States, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to Mr. H. C. Brochel, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman of the special committee to represent the State as to this project.

LESTER SCHILD,
Alderman.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich.—

Whereas legislation appertaining to the participation of the United States and Canada in the St. Lawrence seaway is now under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate; and

This council, believing that this project is of great strategic value from the standpoint of national defense and security and is vital to the industrial development of the entire Great Lakes and Middle West area, does hereby place itself on record as being in favor of the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, in conjunction with the Dominion of Canada, and does hereby petition the Foreign Relations Committee to report this matter out of committee and allow it to be considered on its merits by all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The city clerk is directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senators FERGUSON and MOODY, all Michigan Members of the House of Representatives, and to the councils of all downriver communities.

Whereas President Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, has recommended to the Congress that immediate action be taken on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas said seaway project is about to be started by the Dominion of Canada, and that it is imperative for the interests of the United States that the United States participate in this great project; and

Whereas we as citizens of Manitowoc and vicinity are deeply concerned about the completion of this project as it will affect the industries and life of this community; and

Whereas Gov. Walter J. Kohler has called upon leaders in all parts of the State of Wisconsin to support this program for the purpose of having the United States participate in this project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc, Wis., That we heartily endorse the plan of the United States participating with the Dominion of Canada in the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Congressman from the State of Wisconsin and to each of the two representa-

tives in the United States Senate and to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway has long been discussed by the Congress of the United States, but no steps have been taken to make it a reality; and

Whereas Canada has recently requested the United States to join it in a program to make the St. Lawrence seaway a reality and has threatened to undertake the program alone if the United States declines to join; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway would be a boon to commerce in the Middle West and would particularly be a desirable asset to metropolitan Milwaukee because it would bring oceangoing vessels from foreign ports directly to Milwaukee; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway would, in a sense, contribute to the defense of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kiwanis Club of South Milwaukee, That this club go on record as favoring the establishment and construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the participation of the United States in this program; be it further

Resolved, That our congressional representatives be urged to take an active part in favoring the participation of the United States in the St. Lawrence seaway program; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Congressman ZABLOCKI.

THE MILWAUKEE TURNERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 14, 1952.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a recent membership meeting, the Milwaukee Turners went on record favoring the St. Lawrence waterway.

We are calling this to your attention so that you may use our support in any favorable action that you may take in favor of an immediate realization of American participation in the seaway.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL L. PRIEBE,
Secretary.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 1435,
Fond Du Lac, Wis.

Senator WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of Local 1435, U. S. A.-C. I. O., I am writing you and asking you to vote in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project because of the great value in service that it will do for agriculture and industry in the midwestern States.

Thank you.

CLIFFORD VAN GORDER,
Recording Secretary.

CARPENTERS' DISTRICT COUNCIL,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 15, 1952.
Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The officers and delegates of the Carpenters' District Council of Milwaukee County and vicinity herewith most urgently appeal to you to use your worthy influence and vote for the passage of the great St. Lawrence waterway project when same comes up for consideration on the floor of the United States Senate.

Hoping this request will receive your immediate attention, we remain

Very truly yours,

CHAS. BARTHOLOMAS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Boutros Mouallem (Rept. No. 1172);

S. 1692. A bill for the relief of Hilde Schindler and her minor daughter, Edeline Schindler (Rept. No. 1173);

S. 1796. A bill for the relief of Bruno Leo Freund (Rept. No. 1174);

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of Martha Brak Foxwell (Rept. No. 1175);

S. 2418. A bill for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others (Rept. No. 1176);

S. 2440. A bill for the relief of Hanne Lore Hart (Rept. No. 1177);

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett (Rept. No. 1178);

H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Maria Sarandrea (Rept. No. 1179); and

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of Hai Soon Lee (Rept. No. 1180).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 523. A bill for the relief of Walter Duschinsky (Rept. No. 1181);

S. 1639. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez (Rept. No. 1182);

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Helen Sado Yamamoto (Rept. No. 1183);

S. 1681. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Seidl and Sister Anna Ambrus (Rept. No. 1184);

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Rhee Song Wu (Rept. No. 1185);

S. 1853. A bill for the relief of Hidemi Nakano (Rept. No. 1186);

S. 1879. A bill for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig (Rept. No. 1187); and

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi (Rept. No. 1189).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Eli Neuberger and her two children (Rept. No. 1188).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2211. A bill to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served; with amendments (Rept. No. 1191).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1190) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

- A-6330838, Acevedo-Gamboa, Juan.
A-7070049, Aguirre, Salvadore, or Salvador Aguirre-Heredi.
A-7070730, Aguirre, Elisea.
A-5669738, Aliprantis, Gerassimos Elias, or Jerry Elias Aliprantis.
A-5898717, Aoki, Hisako, or Hisa Aoko.
A-4564620, Baker, Fay, or Fay Bass or Faige Haas.
A-6040312, Hass, Morris.
A-5140696, Barata, Jose Antunes, or Joseph Antunes Barata.
A-3933627, Barba, Jesus Munoz, alias Ewigdio Munoz Barba and Emilio Barba.
A-7351287, Barry, Florence May Evelyn.
A-1514930, Birle, Friedrich Karl, or Kritz or Fred Birle.
A-6887046, Boyd, Blanche Theresa (nee Wamington).
A-2846568, Burgess, Miriam Constance (nee Murphy).
A-7122604, Camamis, Theodora.
A-4800910, Candellini, Mario.
A-5098486, Charous, Albin, or Albin Roebebling.
A-7297258, Chen, Bu Shing.
A-6958543, Cheng, Shang-Wu.
A-6848447, Cheng, Tsu-I Wang.
A-3961645, Cheney, Jennie Bastina.
A-2327066, Chiba, Akira.
A-3629239, Chin-Tsuei, Lee, Alias Anne Lee Young.
A-3217461, Chiwaki, Ai (nee Tamura).
A-6388596, Chung, Roberto Yi Tack.
A-6849314, Cotte, Charles Marie Jean.
A-7171732, Cotte, Marie Henriette, or Marie Louise Cotte (nee Charlemagne).
A-5127606, Dalberg, Teobold Ludwig.
A-6669920, Diamond, Bella (nee Greenberg), or Blanka Diakentsztein.
A-5273768, DiMatteo, Francisco, alias DiMatteo Frank, Frank Calligaree.
A-5363172, Duran, Consuelo.
A-5004726, Elfe, Frederick.
A-7371791, Elefmann, Hartmut.
A-6839917, Faustino, Fae Judith.
A-6839918, Faustino, Daniel.
A-1000241, Fischer, George Richard, or George Milong.
A-7361933, Fischl, Bertl David, or David Bertl Fischl or Bertl David.
A-4939160, Flood, Thomas James.
A-7179926, Fodo, Andrew.
A-6910444, Fogel, Isaac.
A-7415215, Foltyn, Renata (nee Leblova).
A-7419832, Fu, An, or Fu An or Fu Au.
A-7399566, Fu, Siu-Lian Chen.
A-7419811, Fu, Hua Priscilla.
A-4011479, Fung, Ping Kan.
A-7270824, Giottis, Niki C., or Niki Petros Apostolidou.
A-6292008, Gosling, Judith Pamela, or Judith Pamela Murdock.
A-6292009, Gosling, Linda Margaret, or Linda Margaret Murdock.
A-2144764, Gunnarson, Gustav Adolf Velfrid, or Gus Gunnarson.
A-5409334, Haack, Heinrich Johann, alias Henry Haack.
A-6400116, Hadidian, Dikran Yenovk.
A-5978530, Hadlund, Peter Larson or Peter Larson or Peter Larson Nedlund.
A-7182778, Haire, Carmen Judy (nee Carmen Judy Furnal).
A-7026369, Hamano, Tadashi.
A-4855815, Hamano, Kamejiro.
A-4855836, Hamano, Shizuko.
A-5924057, Harris, Johnnie, or John Harris or Charlie or Jolly Robinson.
A-7424123, Harrison, Katherine Christina, formerly Pirkko Helena Piparinen.
A-3767849, Higuchi, Hatsuno.
A-5465265, Hinsch, Dorothea Frieda (nee Lindborst).
A-7809492, Hulsbusch, Hansi Curt.
A-7809493, Hulsbusch, Mario Detlef.
A-7809941, Hulsbusch, Evelyn Margaret.
A-5313389, Hsi-Tseng, Wen, or Wen Shi Tseng.
A-7390943, Illinger, Karl Heinz.
A-2443853, Ishikawa, Toshitaro.
A-2946491, Ishikawa, Komano Orta.
A-4094816, Jackson, Jerry Francis.
A-2319648, Jennings, Grace Mildred Violet (nee Whate), or Grace Mildred Scott.
A-4559276, Jensen, Aksel Elon.
A-1811886, Judith, Avram Miso, or Avram M. Judith or Avrah Judith.
A-5436861, Kanakakis, Antonios Steve, or Anthony Kanakakis.
A-3017281, Kanapka, George.
A-6921703, Kanderis, Evangelos, or Angelos Kanderis.
A-1262169, Karagianis, Matheos S.
A-3356210, Kawaguchi, Raizo.
A-1651081, Kefalas, Spyridon Charanam-bos, or Spiros Charambos Kefalas or Spiros Harry Kefalas.
A-5661155, Kent, Walter Kee, or Bing Kee Kent or Kan Kee.
A-6725862, Kondratenko, Nikolai, or Nicholas Kondratenko or Nicholas De Witt.
A-4398788, Kubota, Gogi, or George Kobe, or George Kubota or Kenzo Kubota.
A-3730612, Laaksonen, Alina Pauline, or Alina Pauline or Senni Rautanen.
A-7045504, Lai, Daniel, or Lai Dou Yen or Lai Dou-Can.
A-7248054, Lau, Monique Marguerite (nee Cherpitel).
A-6261598, Lazarou, Christina (nee Hagistilladou).
A-6841244, Lee, Song Kwan, or Paul Lee Molina.
A-3466717, Lee, Yong Soon, or Choi Yong Soon.
A-7363010, Ledee, Joseph Gilbert.
A-7975408, Lefevre, Claude Shu.
A-7975410, Lefevre, Cecilia Sophie.
A-1865838, Li, Lien Yen.
A-5147578, Lightenstein, Ida (nee Zangwill).
A-6589927, Ling, Frank Yu-Suan, alias Yu-Shan Ling.
A-6437087, Llinares, Juan Salleras.
A-7247981, Lum, Yuk Wah, or Jenny Lum (nee Yuk Wah Noy).
A-7392099, Mack, Marion Ione or Ione (nee Christian or Smith).
A-5466819, Madokoro, Sannosuke.
A-7392826, Madonna, Carla (nee Paganelli).
A-3961538, Marcy, Grace Bethune (nee Grace Elwaine Bethune).
A-4921405, Mattes, Stergios Christ.
A-5303729, Milanese, Giacomo.
A-3263640, Milgrom, Bella.
A-1650278, Miura, Koshiro.
A-1650279, Miura, Haruko, or Haruko Masuda (MN).
A-6335361, Moayeri, Nilufar.
A-2152035, Mohammed, Saleh Ali, or Salih Ali or Sahli Ali or Saleh Ali.
A-7540739, Morel, Andree, or Andree Justine Morel.
A-5833521, Morin, Ernest.
A-3050745, Moulis, Steve, of Efstathios Moulis.
A-7397883, Muehlberger, Heinrich Peter, or Heinrich Peter Jud.
A-7427806, Mullikin, Peggy Ruth, formerly Princess Peggy Macedowski.
A-7118804, Musallam, Sami Nimer (Doctor).
A-5394629, Nishikawa, Takeshi, or Philip Nishikawa.
A-6840225, Ortega y Barrera, Nieves, or Nieves Soto y Ortega.
A-4608756, Oshita, Shigematsu, or Naozo Mukai.
A-4608755, Oshita, Rikiye, or Kiyono Mukai.
A-7646867, Parker, Johanna Shizu Nari-shima.
A-4472505, Pagano, Giuseppe, or Joseph Pagano.
A-6054277, Penn, Gloria Ludena.
A-7778976, Penn, Reuben Alfredo.
A-7978975, Penn, Dorriel.
A-5612932, Perez, Jose, or Jose Perez Rodriguez or Jose Perez Seoane.
A-7450566, Perez, Antonio Nelson, or Antonio Nelson Perez y Soto.
A-6357861, Perkins, Julia Maria Kim, alias Julia Maria Han or Julia Maria Han y Kim, or Mrs. Harry Kim Perkins.
A-7240127, Pieczynski, Therese Josephine, formerly Therese Josephine Vanden Abeele or Therese Josephine Vaden.
A-7394770, Pietro, Rita (nee Bartollino).
A-4571123, Pinkovsky, John, or John Robert Shuka.
A-2631467, Pires, Ignacio.
A-9688319, Pither, Reginald Leonard.
A-6970339, Paju, Maryvonne, alias Maryvonne Marthe Toussina Larcher.
A-6970340, Paju, Marianne, alias Marianne Louise Neele Larcher.
A-9794365, Poupalos, Manolis Constantine, or Manolis Poupalos.
A-1122251, Pujol, Pedro Sellares, alias Pablo Salas.
A-2056077, Putala, Veronica, or Sister Mary Gisella.
A-6635466, Reyes y Navarro, Simon.
A-5422921, Ritter, Huldreich, or Charles Ritter.
A-3995038, Roberts, Ada Jessie.
A-6310149, Robbins, Rose.
A-4062904, Robinson, Jack, or Joaquin Antonio Rodriguez or Joachim Rodriguez.
A-5172002, Robson, Hilda Arias, or Hilda Tyndall or Hilda Munoz Arias or Hilda Arias Torry or Hilda Socorro Arias or Hilda Arias Tyndall Torry.
A-6377064, Rocos, George Constantine, or George C. Bocos.
A-6377037, Rocos, Grammatiki Ioannou, or Grammatiki (Kiki) Rocos or Niki Grammatiki Rocos, or Riki Rocos or Kiki Grammatiki Ioannou or Grammatiki (Kiki) Ioannou or Kiki Ioannou.
A-7361475, Rogers, Gabriel Frank, or Gabriel Ferenc Jausz.
A-2357775, Rose, Stanley John.
A-1074016, Russell, Marcel Gaston, or George Kinelle or George Kinelli.
A-9631664, Salvador, Rafael.
A-6704923, Samppala, Leha Marjatta (nee Nenonen), alias Marietta Samppala.
A-6082604, Saunders, Dudley Livingston, or Dudley Saunders or Dudley Saunders or Robert James Day.
A-4942528, Scheibner, Albert Kurt, or Albert Kurt Scheibel.
A-3651799, Schuller, Katharina, or Katharine Baumel.
A-5300176, Schwarder, Stephenie Eva, or Stephenie Eva Murphy (nee Daunis).
A-5362775, Scotti, Pasquale Scotti, or Patsy Scotti.
A-1462488, Sideris, Nicholas Aristides, alias Nick Sideris.
A-2963769, Siordia-Languren, Fernando, or Fernando Langurel Siordia.
A-5912083, Smith, Edward Joseph.
A-6268657, Smith, Raphaela Albertha, or Raphaela Albertha Roumow.
A-4895918, Singh, Bisham, or Sucha Singh or Bishha Singh or Sunday Singh.
A-4185278, Solis, Guillermina Febles.
A-1718074, Soto, Jose Migueles, or Jose Soto.
A-5212079, Stathos, Koula Vasiliki (nee Vouvalidou).
A-4809160, Stenesto, Martin Nicholas, or Martin Nilsen or Maurice Nelson or Martin Nicholas Nelsen Stenesto or Martin Nielsen.
A-6840090, Stephenson, Patrick John.
A-7112539, Stewart, Vincent.
A-1235075, Strougo, Victor, or Raymond Andre Lopez y Ateca or Artagas.
A-7375959, Suemming, Bodo, or Bodo Fritz Kurt Suemming.
A-3284493, Sungy, Helen Jeanette, or Helen Jeanette Logas.
A-2252832, Suzuki, Ichiro.
A-5972594, Tores, Milan Teodor, or Emile M. Tores.
A-3479084, Tavares, Ludgero, alias Luther Tavares.
A-7423302, Thigpen, Jessie Benjamin.
A-6836237, Thomas, Arthur Livermoor.
A-4931820, Ting, Anthony Un-Noeh.

A-4941257, Torres, Frances, or Frances Aguilar or Frances Ruerta.
 A-5634703, Torres de Arredondo, Trinidad.
 A-7050974, Trillo, Antonio, or Antonio Trillo Ordonez.
 A-7050973, Trillo, Matilde.
 A-7283636, Tuzon, Ernesto.
 A-2022521, Tye, Soo Cheong.
 A-2942693, Vamasescu, Nicolas.
 A-2942694, Vamasescu, Despina Igorosanu, or Pal Icy.
 A-7287089, Veloz-Cuevas, Tomas.
 A-3392392, Webel, Anna.
 A-5253477, Weissberg, Otto, alias Otto Whitehill.
 A-4892331, Whitlow, John William, or Jack Whitlow.
 A-2626095, Wilson, Marguerite M. (nee Landry), formerly Boggs.
 A-7011658, Won, Eng Seow, or Yvonne Eng.
 A-9579093, Wooster, Walter William, or Chang Kum Sul.
 A-4344406, Wuertle, Otto.
 A-5363224, Yamaguchi, Hide, or Hide Tokunaga.
 A-4391435, Ying, Chang Mo or Chang, or Bobby.
 A-4069093, Yoshimura, Shinichi, or Henry Yoshimura.
 A-7457347, Young, Beatrice Raymonde.
 A-2583858, Ysidro, Montoya-Salazar.
 A-6268799, Yuen, Lee Shau, or Lee Sing Pik.
 A-6313255, Yuen, Louise Lore.
 A-2075484, Zipper, Fannie, or Florence Gardner.
 A-7203901, Zuentenstein, Alfred.
 A-3504425, Akasaki, Yoshio, or Yoshito Akasaki.
 A-3099496, Akasaki, Isoko, or Isoko Ishimuro.
 A-4732801, Akiyama, Shizuko (nee Shizuko Tada).
 A-3282640, Akume, Hanori, or Roy Akune.
 A-3900724, Alleyne, Rosa Ambrosine, alias Rose Ambrozane Alleyne.
 A-5537133, Angelini, Guido, or Guido Blascovich.
 A-4931914, Arata, Carlo Angelo, or Carlo Arata or Carlo Lodi.
 A-1205335, Arehart, Fernanda Maria (nee Peverini).
 A-7247946, Aversa, Rosaria Marrone.
 A-5651299, Avina, Antonio, Andrade.
 A-7457937, Baeshore, Karin Franziska.
 A-7197107, Baker, Hasmig Ruth (nee Kuledjian), alias Hasnik Kesmezkilli.
 A-6363434, Ball, Cyril Thomas.
 A-6363435, Ball, Alwen Elizabeth.
 A-7539287, Barton, George Donald.
 A-5388747, Becht, Margaret Ellen (nee Me-thot).
 A-4664561, Bercich, Peter, or Petar Brcic.
 A-7094381, Berger, Karin Hildegard.
 A-7371685, Blessas, Robert, or Robert Massimo Blessas or Massimo Robert Blessas formerly Robert Massimo Valone.
 A-8461098, Blumberg, Leib.
 A-1005545, Bonifer, Loretta Annie (nee White (or LeBlanc)), or Loretta Annie Wells.
 A-2585740, Boyajian, Mariam, or Mary or Mariam Manogian or Mariam Ambojian.
 A-6986704, Bramble, Yvonne Mak Ching (nee Foo).
 A-7203650, Brand, Shimon, or Simon Brand.
 A-5948261, Brathwaite, Charles Christopher.
 A-9671236, Bresler, Petrus Hermanus.
 A-6453789, Broacha, Firoze Hormusji.
 A-6740253, Bronstein, Menachem or Melvin.
 A-6887700, Bronstein, Estera or Esther (nee Duybner).
 A-7222003, Brylkin, Ariadne.
 A-1141021, Cantatore, Mauro, or Maurice Cantatore.
 A-71122688, Castro-Castro, Moises.
 A-5067641, Catalano, Agatino.
 A-6026529, Chang, Peh-I.
 A-2174443, Chavez-Soto, Felipe.
 A-4940843, Cheung, Goon Man, or David Jung or David Yuen.

A-2460182, Chung, Celia Tam (Tam Jung Wan).
 A-7011010, Chung, Julia.
 A-7011008, Chung, Jennie.
 A-7011009, Chung, Mamie.
 A-4442569, Comeau, James Percy.
 A-4891359, Costanzo, Gregorio Pietro.
 A-7394509, Craun, Gunther Franz, or Gunther Franz Mages.
 A-2600753, Cubas, Ferdinand, alias Ferdie Cubas.
 A-3958279, Curry, Madlyn Hope.
 A-6004158, Daniels, Rose.
 A-6643125, Davila-Davila, Francisco Jesus.
 A-4248186, DeFauw, Yvonne.
 A-5265622, DeFernandez, Eulalia Barron (nee Eulalia Barron).
 A-7037822, Fernandez-Barron, Luis.
 A-7420861, Deike, Eileen Bostwick.
 A-4861423, De La Bat, Bernade Jan Gerard.
 A-5641047, DeLara, Carmen Davila, alias Carmen Bieggar alias Carmen Devila Alvarez.
 A-4913533, DeLopez, Rafaela Luevano, or Rafaela Luevano.
 A-3778612, DeLopez, Soledad Maria de los Santos, alias Soledad Maria delos Santos de Quiros.
 A-7266087, DeLuna, Ursula Martinez.
 A-4162187, Demers, Josephine Mary (nee Josephine Mary Gagnow).
 A-7356333, DeMeyer, Joseph Joannes.
 A-7421594, DeMeyer, Jacqueline Marguerite.
 A-7421595, DeMeyer, Simonne Elagie.
 A-6062958, Doane, Evalyn, Victoria (nee Clarke).
 A-9736923, DosSantos, Americo Rodrigues.
 A-4694706, Dick, May Belle, or Christine May Belle Dick (nee Hamilton).
 A-7099288, Doetsch, Karl Maximilian.
 A-7083776, Drieling, Leendert.
 A-7070170, Duran, Jesus Rafael Liron, or Rafael Liron or Rafael Liron-Duran.
 A-7079650, Durando, Gerard Victor.
 A-7354173, Emmel, Evelyn Cornelia.
 A-7050949, Esqueda, Maria Teresa.
 A-7050948, Esqueda, Donaciano.
 A-7387447, Evers, Arnold Stanley.
 A-5390997, Febles, Silviana Francesca.
 A-5833478, Folsom, Ellen Rose.
 A-6014862, Fraser, Esme Iola or "Greaves" or "Viola."
 A-2359744, Friedman, Harry Raphael, or Freeman.
 A-1148404, Fris, Josefina, or Josipa Frisch.
 A-2744898, Gallo-Ruiz, Eliliano, or Eliliano Gallo.
 A-1452184, Galioto, Gaetano.
 A-4475577, Georges, Ainsworth Bunting, or Louis J. Brown.
 A-7203245, Gillbreath, Vera Agnes, or Vera Agnes Allen or Vera Agnes Doane.
 A-1704613, Goldstein, Rose.
 A-7427541, Goltzman, Salomon, or Salomon Goltzman.
 A-7445236, Gonzales, Jose B.
 A-4022837, Gonzales-Carranza, Simon.
 A-7049673, Gomez, Jose Guadalupe.
 A-7049672, Gomez, Miguel.
 A-7180855, Gonzales-Renteria, Raul.
 A-6603154, Gonzales y Reyes, Angel, or Angel Gonzales.
 A-4299747, Gonzales-Zepeda, Fortino.
 A-4035970, Goodhart, John, alias John Goodhart.
 A-4338638, Grauman, Regina, or Krojna Rywka Groman or Kreine Rivk Grauman or Kreine Rivka Jannof.
 A-1229899, Grieve, John Davidson, or Jack Grieve.
 A-4742456, Grinberg, Herman Karl.
 A-3262533, Hai, Jung Won, or Mrs. Wong On.
 A-7186411, Haight, Eileen Annie (nee Clancy).
 A-3636876, Hamblen, Irene Isabelle, alias Irene Isabelle Boon.
 A-6887941, Hamblin, Jewell Violet Pearl.
 A-3154461, Helgeson, Henry, or Henry Helgeson.

A-5328574, Henry, Lillian Gladys (nee Antill).
 A-4506192, Hernandez, Mariano, or Mario Hernandez.
 A-1512737, Hazeltine, Helen Hilda, or Helen Hilda Roux or Helen Hilda Thorogood.
 A-2999950, Hiraoka, Tadaichi, or George Hiraoka or George Yoshimoto or Seigaku Yoshimoto.
 A-7469546, Hodge, Enid Iova, or Enid Iova Thomas.
 A-6847772, Hu, Hung Yuan.
 A-7056883, Jansen, Avran, alias Avram Gansen.
 A-1048853, Jusup, Kadir Bin, or Kader Jusup.
 A-7354074, Jimenez, Arsenio Teodoro.
 A-7274105, Johnson, Rosario Serra, or Rosario G. Serra or Rosario Serra Gavito.
 A-4720874, Johnson-Martinez, Bernabe.
 A-6732408, Kalman, Ferenc.
 A-4902559, Kaptain, Violet, formerly Suffolk (nee Coleman).
 A-7197992, Kazarian, Shavarah.
 A-7037455, Kennicutt, Ruth Jeanette Kenny, alias Ruth Jeanette Kenny alias Jeanne (Jannette) (Ruth) Kenny, alias Janie Louise Jette, alias Louise Jette, or Ruth Malloy.
 A-7276640, Kolb, Ida Crescencia, or Ida Crescencia Hatz or Ida Crescencia Rogner.
 A-6680598, Kontarakis, Helen, or Helene S. Countorakis.
 A-7244992, Korey, Dorothy (nee Delih Badou Sand).
 A-2924446, Knickle, Goldie Evelyn (nee Mason).
 A-8001048, Ladan, Samuel, or Samuel Ladan Vinju.
 A-2515839, Landeta, Jose (Jose Landetta), or Jose Domingo Landeta.
 A-6059440, Lee, Karl C., Alias Ki-Cheng Lee.
 A-5098788, Livingston, Florence Elizabeth, formerly Florence McLean or Florence Schmidt (nee Florence Allen).
 A-7049121, Lolzides, Soumela (nee Anastasiadis), or Sourela Panagiotou Anastasiadou.
 A-5276973, Machida, Masaru Michael.
 A-6920375, Maillett, Marie Louise (nee Frontain), formerly Dougette.
 A-6881284, Mancusi, Albert.
 A-3909619, Mark, Gock Lum, or Mark Lum, or Gock L. Mark.
 A-7178884, Marmolejo, Guadalupe.
 A-7274221, Marquez, Pedro.
 A-7550734, McCarthy, Terence Michael.
 A-7023632, McNevin, Harry Angus.
 A-6859638, Mendelowitz, Charlotte.
 A-6556882, Mendelowitz, Fani (nee David-ovics).
 A-6859052, Mendelowitz, Betty.
 A-6556883, Singer, Flora (nee Mendelowitz).
 A-4790454, Mocellin, Giovanni Battista, or John B. Mocellin.
 A-3076904, Montes de Villalva, Carmen.
 A-6767320, Mosiewick, Zimel, or Zimel Masowicke.
 A-5406058, Munoz y Sotomayor, Benjamin, or Benjamin Munoz.
 A-7363000, Nesrallah, Abdou, or Abdu Messralla.
 A-1124376, Nicolich, Giuseppe, or Antonio Nicolich.
 A-4152724, Oishi, Satoshi.
 A-7020467, Oishi, Yei, or El Oishi.
 A-2742641, Ong, Helen, or Lim Tan Shing.
 A-2381190, Oropesa-Herrera or Sister Rita Oropesa or Sister Rita del Immaculada Corazon de Maria Oropesa.
 A-7280044, Orphanos, Anastacia.
 A-7755920, Pasaidis, Fedon Hristodulos, or Don Pasaidis or Fedon Pasaidis.
 A-3622420, Peeke, Wallace Frank or Frank Wallace Smith or Frank Wallace Peeke.
 A-6743196, Percy, Julie Anne, or Julie Anne Riley.
 A-7358577, Petronio, Vivitta Giovanna.

A-7358563, Petronio, Luigi, or Louis Petronio.
 A-7358578, Petronio, Carlo Federico.
 A-5201260, Pezzella, Rafaele, or Ralph Pezzella, alias Domenico Mugnano.
 A-2207816, Pichot, Marcel Pierre Jean-Maria.
 A-7681487, Polychroniadis, Lazaros Serafim.
 A-3273809, Poulymenos, Eleftherios K., or Theodor Coroukly.
 A-6965318, Prevost, Edmond Vallone, or Edmond Prevost.
 A-6394556, Przewozman, Abraham.
 A-2569854, Quirke, Anna Margaret, or Annie Margaret Quirke.
 A-7264310, Quon Jeung Wing, or Wong Jeung Wing Quon.
 A-7280071, Rahm, Helga.
 A-7280072, Rahm, Ernest.
 A-7365496, Raschle, Rudolph Richard.
 A-6159552, Remenyi, Janos, or John Remenyi.
 A-5662563, Riley, Florence Francis (nee Ryan).
 A-7083553, Rios, Estandisao, or Estandisado Rios or Estandisao Rios-Cervantes.
 A-7083554, Rios, Rito.
 A-7130250, Rios, Rosalio, or Rosalio Rios-Lozano.
 A-5596513, Robb, William Glen.
 A-5450855, Robles-Mendez, Alberto.
 A-7140431, Roman-Yerena, Antonio.
 A-7140465, Roman-Salinas, Enrique.
 A-7140466, Roman-Salinas, Rafael.
 A-6931254, Said, Hylda Kathleen (nee Allison).
 A-5223429, Sanchez, Emilio Hermida, or Emilio Hermida.
 A-3778615, Santos, Adolfo Quiros-de los, alias Adolph Santos Lopez.
 A-3677416, Sasajima, Jiso, or Henry Jiso Sasajima.
 A-1439133, Sanduski, Anastasia Serheenko, or Anastasia Sergeenko.
 A-2790568, Santo, Marcel Marrugat, or Marcel Maraugat.
 A-2328059, Scheibling, Joseph.
 A-7209608, Schmidt, Hede Erika.
 A-5830296, Shields, Ellen.
 A-4352885, Sjoberg, Victor Sigfrid.
 A-7387476, Small, Eva, alias Eva Goldine or Eva Goodman.
 A-5925127, Smith, Albert Auston, or Bert Smith.
 A-659202, Smith, Mary, or Mary Guerrero (nee Mary Cockhoft).
 A-7022573, Soenarie, Devi Soetinah, or Devi Tinan or Cecilia.
 A-9777435, Soenarie, Peter, alias Eddie Linau.
 A-3079320, Soler-Carvajal, Antonio, or Antonio Soler or Escanvajal.
 A-3409677, Soloria-Chavez, Bonifacio.
 A-1579036, Sommer, Hans Max.
 A-7510754, Spartaly, John, or John Charles Spartaly.
 A-5668955, Steinhart, William Edward, or William Edward Hart.
 A-7418258, Steinnagel, Marion Elene.
 A-7415850, Stone, Barbara Alexandria, or Barbara Fink Stone or Barbara Alexandria Cottschaik.
 A-4868555, Summers, Azalia Lydia, or Lydia Summers (nee Wilkins).
 A-3456536, Sun, David Cheng-Chin.
 A-4203061, Sun, Yuan Mei S.
 A-7203116, Sweeting, Viola, or Annie Sweeting.
 A-3201677, Symynuk, William, or William Samson.
 A-4768752, Tamm, Johannes, or John Tamm.
 A-3216884, Tamotsu, Tokio, or Tokio Sumi or Jackie T. Tamotsu.
 A-4775443, Terceno, Joaquin Paul, or Joaquin Terceno or Joaquin Pablo Terceno.
 A-1315498, Thwaites, Joseph William.
 A-7026332, Tinajero-Martinez, Sergio Flavio, or Sergio Tinajero.

A-7092856, Torres-Pena, Raul, or Raul Torres.
 A-7118444, Toro-Balderas, Joel Del.
 A-7118445, Toro-Balderas, Maria Isabel Del.
 A-7280006, Ullrich, Helga, or Helga O'Brien or Helga Josephine Smrcka.
 A-7065632, Urban, Chon King.
 A-1008912, Vasquez, Guadalupe, or Guadalupe Gonzalez.
 A-2353005, Vennola, Einick William, or Eino William Vennola.
 A-7463077, Verley, Allan.
 A-4540341, Vidor, Laszlo, or Ladislaus Vidor or Leslie Vidor.
 A-2507036, Villafana-Gambino, Vicente.
 A-7178315, Villescias, Ignacia.
 A-7203023, Watson, William.
 A-5448561, Weitz, Zygmund, or Zygmunt Weitz, alias Sigmund Wites.
 A-7222488, Wharton, Margaret Madonna.
 A-4795107, Williams, Clara Muriel (nee Hall).
 A-7036941, Winge, Claude Patrick, or Klaus Helm.
 A-1437824, Winter, Richard.
 A-7248004, Wolf, Ellen Dora Johanna (nee Schacht).
 A-7365177, Woo, How Ah, or Ah Hou Wu.
 A-6057673, Woods, Diana.
 A-4769465, Woods, Carlo Emanuel.
 A-4937011, Young, Dorothy Lillian, or Dorothy Lillian Mizen.
 A-5040480, Zissis, Constantinos Tryfon, or Constant T. Zissis.
 A-2752654, Gounaris, Spiros Demetrios, or Spiridos Goumanis.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:
 S. 2664. A bill for the relief of Selma Cesur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
 S. 2665. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Hollweg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:
 S. 2666. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (by request):
 S. 2667. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUNDT:
 S. 2668. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'CONOR:
 S. 2669. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NIXON:
 S. 2670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eileen Wilson; and

S. 2671. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jagannath P. Chawla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:
 S. 2672. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:
 S. 2673. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall'Aida, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIAM N. OATIS—PROPOSED BREAKING OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on July 17, 1951, I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 175) urging that our State Department take appropriate steps to impress upon the Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia the indignation of our citizens at the unjust imprisonment of William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent.

The resolution called on United States delegates to make suitable representation to the United Nations and, further, recommended the suspension of all trade between the citizens of this country and Czechoslovakia until the release of Mr. Oatis.

In the 7 months which have followed, the Communists now governing that ill-fated country have given clear evidence that they do not intend to act fairly and justly in the Oatis case. In answer to our representatives in the United Nations, their spokesmen have hurled invective upon invective and have resorted to further baseless charges and insults both concerning Mr. Oatis and the entire United States Government.

In accordance with the recommendations of my resolution (S. 175), action was subsequently taken by our Government to prohibit trade between citizens of the United States and Czechoslovakia until the release of Mr. Oatis, but even this moderate retaliatory move did not effectuate his release.

It is apparent that attempts through diplomatic channels will be futile. Soft words or appeals to a supposed sense of justice, it is now unmistakably clear, will not persuade these international bandits to desist in their calculated affronts to our Nation. Only the most drastic reprisals will bring them to a realization that the American people are determined not to be parties to any relationship with such unprincipled oppressors.

William Oatis is languishing in prison now for almost a year for the sole reason that he is an American. Obviously the allegations against him were spurious and his trial a farcical miscarriage of justice. The Communist tyrants who are holding him in prison refuse even to allow him the ordinary right of consulting with our official representatives.

Why should we continue diplomatic relationships with such a tyrannical regime? To carry on formally the supposed friendly and respectable negotiations which diplomacy implies is a mockery. An honorable and trustworthy nation cannot put itself on the same level as one which is operated by murderers, outlaws, and brigands. To maintain endlessly such a reciprocal relationship entails a lessening of respect which upright and conscientious citizens have for their government.

Of course, there will be some who will say that we should continue to have our Ambassador in this iron-curtain country so that information can be procured and observations made from within the borders of that unhappy land. But the price we are paying is too high. The continuance of their cowardly oppres-

sion of a dutiful and high-minded newspaperman is both a frontal attack on basic freedoms and a dastardly insult to our Nation.

William Oatis should be shown that his country has not abandoned him and will not put itself on any level with his oppressors. The free world should be told that the Communist dictators, now governing Czechoslovakia, are unworthy of the confidence of decent governments. These facts can be made abundantly clear by a severance of our diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia. I now submit for appropriate reference a resolution, the purpose of which is to accomplish that objective.

The resolution (S. Res. 279), submitted by Mr. O'CONOR, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communist government of Czechoslovakia has falsely accused and unjustly convicted William N. Oatis, an American citizen, of charges of espionage and has subjected the said William N. Oatis to continuous indignities and is now confining the said William N. Oatis in imprisonment, all of which constitutes a grave affront to the Government and people of the United States and is in violation of the basic rules of long-established international conduct; and

Whereas the Government of Czechoslovakia has refused to permit the ordinary diplomatic visitation of representatives of the United States to the said William N. Oatis; and

Whereas such conduct on the part of the Government of Czechoslovakia, if not effectively challenged, will invite other acts of international brigandage against the United States by governments having the same political philosophies as the Government of Czechoslovakia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia should be terminated immediately, and should be resumed only if and when the Government of Czechoslovakia gives suitable assurances to the Government of the United States that it will release unconditionally from imprisonment the said William N. Oatis and extend to the Government and people of the United States the courtesy and treatment normally befitting the relations between friendly nations.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5505) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Rowland Keough Hazard, of Rhode Island, to be district attorney for the Canal Zone, vice Daniel E. McGrath, resigned.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC.,
PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

Lincoln Day address entitled "America Needs New Leadership in Washington," delivered by him at Winona, Minn., February 12, 1952.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Address delivered by him before the Nebraska Reclamation Association on February 14, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him at the meeting of the Palm Beach County Republican Executive Committee at West Palm Beach, Fla., February 16, 1952.

By Mr. IVES:

Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator CARLSON in Brooklyn, N. Y., on February 12, 1952.

Editorial entitled "To the Republican Voters of New Hampshire," published in the New York Times of February 13, 1952.

By Mr. LODGE:

Lincoln Day address delivered on February 12, 1952, by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, before the Middlesex Club, of Boston, Mass.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address on the military implications of atomic energy delivered by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves before New York Sales Executives Club on February 5, 1952.

Article entitled "Ten Questions for Truman If He Runs on Issue of Peace," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 14, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Copy of letter addressed by him to the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, under date of February 15, 1952, dealing with the Iranian oil dispute; and a copy of article 1 of the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

By Mr. HOBY:

Address delivered at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Raleigh, N. C., on February 9, 1952, by Frank E. McKinney, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Article entitled "Are You a Good Citizen?" written by Charles Edison and published in the American Weekly for February 17, 1952.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Editorial entitled "Freedom of Speech Is Too Precious To Make Cloture Easier To Invoke," published in the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph of February 13, 1952.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Article entitled "Can an Eighteenth-Century Congress Do a Twentieth-Century Job?" published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 17, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Article entitled "One-Percent Plan," published in the January 31, 1952, edition of the Voice of Korea.

By Mr. ECTON:

Article entitled "Protest Hauling of Dangerous Explosives Over Nation's Highways," from the February issue of the Locomotive Engineers Journal.

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message to the Lithuanian people on the recent occasion of the thirty-fourth anniversary of their independence.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE BY UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES TO THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA ON THE OCCASION OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA, FEBRUARY 16, 1952

I have the great honor to extend my warm greetings and best wishes to Americans of Lithuanian descent on the thirty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. At the same time, and with deep humility, I express my sincerest hopes that the people of Lithuania may soon be freed from the yoke of the tyrant.

The American people, on this occasion, express their admiration for the gallant resistance offered by the heroic Lithuanian people to their oppressors. Soviet aggression has brought to Lithuania untold suffering and misery, and is reducing this proud nation to a slave state. This inhuman treatment is a source of deep concern and distress to all Americans.

The Government of the United States will never recognize this Soviet conquest of the Republic of Lithuania. The people of the United States look forward to the day when the valiant people of Lithuania will once again join the free nations of the world. They pray this day is not too distant.

The American people extend the hand of friendship to the brave people of Lithuania. They know that the flame of liberty, kindled 34 years ago, will continue to burn brightly in the hearts of all Lithuanians and will give them the strength to resist the oppressor until he is driven from the soil of Lithuania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Saturday, February 16, marked the thirty-fourth anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. The tragic story of the brutal subjugation of this noble and courageous people by Soviet tyranny has been repeated in this Chamber many times. The now-familiar Kremlin pattern of aggressive imperialism was fully revealed in the Baltic States between 1939 and 1940, and since that time the people of Lithuania have been virtual slaves to the Soviet dictatorship.

We know, Mr. President, that the spirit of freedom is still alive in Lithuania, as it is, indeed in the hearts and minds of the millions of peoples forced to live under Soviet tyranny. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country and proved to us that fundamentally we have much in common with them. We are proud to have many citizens of Lithuanian descent in our great country. I am particularly gratified that so many of them are citizens of the State of New Jersey.

It is with both determination and hope that I join these citizens in celebrating this thirty-fourth anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, and pray with them that freedom and

independence may soon be restored to their fatherland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the good Lithuanian residents of my own State, I should like to associate myself completely with what the Senator from New Jersey has said.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on the occasion of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the observance of Lithuanian independence, the day which marked the celebration of Lithuania's resuming her place among the free nations of the world, attention should be called to the outstanding role the citizens of Lithuanian birth or descent have played in our history.

A striking contrast exists between our fellow citizens from Lithuania and the rigid life of regimentation their relatives and friends must be compelled to lead in their native country. It is a glorious tribute to the character of these people that despite the odds in their fight for freedom, their efforts continue more vigorously than ever.

The outstanding accomplishments of our citizens of Lithuanian birth and ancestry many of whom have chosen to make their home in the State of Maryland, and are of our finest citizenry, deserve the highest commendation of all Americans. It is a pleasure to join with them and all friends of Lithuania in extending the highest praise and in voicing the hope that this splendid people may soon regain their freedom and their honored place among the nations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the past several years it has been my practice to speak briefly in the Senate on the occasion of the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Each year it is my fervent hope that the next anniversary will find the noble people of Lithuania restored to the family of free nations, a destiny for which their history and traditions so obviously entitle them. The tragic fact is again apparent that little direct progress has been made.

There is, however, increasing hope in the fact that as the people of the democracies become stronger and stronger, prospects for a durable world peace become more hopeful. The most effective action which we can take is to continue building peace through strength and thus be in a position to put diplomatic pressure on the Kremlin so that their policy of extermination will have to be abandoned.

These are the steps which bring to the long-suffering people of Lithuania the best hope for restoration. I say to Americans and particularly those who have close ties with the homeland of Lithuania that all is not hopeless. The day will come when the nightmare will be over. I pray that it is not far off.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I sent to the Lithuanian-American Information Center, in connection with the thirty-fourth anniversary of Lithuanian independence February 14, 1952.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1952.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y.:

It is with mixed emotions of sorrow and respect that I today pay homage to the glorious courage of the people of Lithuania and their descendants and friends all over the world on this thirty-fourth anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

My heart is weighted with sorrow because the valiant Lithuanian nation has been shorn of its independence by its enemies today. I am horrified at the mounting list of her people that have been murdered which has reached one-half million.

Day after day we receive reports that farm folk are living in virtual slavery under the iron rule of collectivism.

The history of Lithuania today is surely a tragic one, however, it is the hope of all that with the help of divine guidance this horrible pressure may someday soon be lifted. We hope that soon Lithuania's independence day may be again publicly celebrated in Lithuania as well as throughout the world.

I am proud that my country and my Government continues to follow a policy of sympathy and aid to those who need it now in the worst years of their existence.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

WILLIAM A. AYRES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I regret to announce the death of William A. Ayres, of Wichita, Kans., a very outstanding citizen of our State, who served for many years in the House of Representatives, and for the past several years has been a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Judge Ayres served as a Member of the Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, and Sixty-sixth Congresses. He was unsuccessful as a candidate for election to the Sixty-seventh Congress, but was elected to serve in the Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third.

He resigned from Congress on August 22, 1934, and was appointed by President Roosevelt to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Since then he has been a member of the Commission and has served intermittently as chairman during many years.

As I have stated, Judge Ayres was an outstanding citizen of our State. He had a very fine and winning personality. He was a kindly man, and those of us who knew him personally loved him very much. He was a man of noble character and won the respect of everyone.

The service of Judge Ayres to Kansas and the Nation was of great value. Our people are indebted to him for the service he rendered during a long and useful life.

To the daughter and family of Judge Ayres I personally wish to express my sincere sympathy.

ADEQUATE AIR SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN
FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on July 10, 1947, I offered an amendment to the military appropriations bill to increase funds for the Air Force so as to provide a

force of 70 groups. That amendment was defeated by a narrow margin. Last year on April 30, in a speech in the Senate setting forth that our air power had fallen to such a low point as to be actually incapable of giving our troops in Europe proper tactical air support, I said at that time:

To send troops overseas without adequate tactical aviation is just exactly the same as sending them into battle without rifles, tanks, or artillery.

I urged that the Air Force be enlarged to 150 groups. Subsequently in a statement which I made before the Appropriations Committee I said:

We have not set our sights high enough and we are not moving fast enough toward even our presently limited objective. . . . We should increase our appropriations so that we are no longer second best.

It was gratifying that the Committee on Appropriations at that time substantially increased the funds for the Air Force.

It was also satisfactory to learn that on October 2 of last year the Joint Chiefs of Staff officially recommended an Air Force of 140 groups.

It seemed at last that we were taking effective steps to build air superiority without which there can be no peace in the world.

Senators will be distressed at the report contained in a New York Times article by Drew Middleton published in the Boston Herald of February 11 under the title "Europe GI's Sitting Ducks for Reds," to which was added the dismaying headline: "Close Air Support Is Lacking in Event of Surprise Attack." The article is so important that I read it:

Despite the great expansion of allied ground forces in Europe during the last year—an increase from two to six United States divisions is the best example—allied infantry and armored divisions could not count on close air support during the opening and perhaps critical phase of a land battle.

There has been no similar increase in the air forces available to counter any Soviet aggression.

Under present conditions, American, British, and French ground forces would have to meet a Red army already superior in numbers and in some types of equipment supported by a quantitatively and qualitatively superior air force.

Unless the Soviet air force was defeated in the air at the outset, it would be months before the Western Powers could muster strength in the air to both check Soviet air attacks and provide support for ground divisions.

"The army must become accustomed to prospect," one British officer said, "of being able to move only at night, to periodic heavy attacks by the enemy's tactical air and of severe limitations on tactical planning. In other words, our armies will be in the same position as the Germans from the middle of 1944 onward."

Allied officers headed by Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad are struggling to bolster the air defense of Europe. The present situation is the result, first, of the present inferiority of the Western Powers in aircraft production, second, of the fact that many continental air forces have planes and pilots but very little else, and third, of insistence, for the sake of morale in most cases, on the building up of the ground forces of Europe.

Finally, the Western Powers are faced with the fact that the present system of bases in Germany, where most of the allied fighter strength is now situated, is unsuitably tactical to the defense of Western Europe from invasion from the east and that, while the allied air force is being built in terms of planes and pilots, this system of bases, maintenance, and logistical support has to be completely overhauled.

No allied air officer thinks that this is a task beyond the capacities of the western world given time. But, of course, they cannot know whether they will have time.

Information reaching western Europe is that Soviet production of MIG-15's and other high capability jet fighters is now in excess of 5,000 a year.

The Allies have better aircraft than the MIG-15. But they are not in production.

And, although the MIG-15, built as an interceptor, has certain deficiencies as a ground support aircraft, it is, as one Air Force officer said: "a whole hell of a lot better than planes we admire in pictures. Our stuff is in pictures. They have it here."

The United States Air Force has the F-86, but production of that fighter, which is considered equal to the MIG-15, is not large. The British have the Hawker P1 1067, but this plane, over which both British and American pilots are enthusiastic, will not reach RAF squadrons until December.

Meanwhile the MIG-15 has replaced obsolete jets in the two Soviet air armies in East Germany.

"If it comes," one American officer said, "we will have to fight with what we have. It's like a ball team. You have to do the best you can in a tough game with the nine guys you have out there. You can't wait for that phenomenal rookie from Terre Haute."

These production deficiencies are at the root of western air inferiority.

Under conditions of a major conflict only the United States Air Forces in Europe and the Royal Air Force are equipped to fight. The continental air forces do not have the administrative facilities, the high officers with engineering experience necessary to carry on warfare from day to day, the maintenance facilities or the proper logistical support.

The following day there appeared an Associated Press dispatch in which Mrs. George A. Davis, Jr., whose husband, Major Davis, America's greatest jet ace, was shot down and presumed killed a week ago, quoted her husband as writing in a recent letter that "things can't go on like they are." Mrs. Davis quoted her husband further, and these are Major Davis' words:

We lose so many planes and so many men. The MIG's are so much better than the Sabres that something must be done.

Mrs. Davis said her husband stated, in a letter written soon after he arrived in Korea last October 21, that "the war's censored and no one knows what goes on over here. They are not trying to win the war. All they want to do is hold and let people get killed."

Mr. President, the Middleton report and the Davis letter are profoundly shocking. How much longer must we wait before we cease the practice of putting American soldiers in exposed positions and American airmen in the skies without the proper equipment they need in order to be able to defend themselves? In Korea we have asked men to lay down their lives in a fight which was not a fight to win. We must not plan the same

mistake for American soldiers in Europe. All American soldiers, wherever they may be, are entitled to all the support and assistance we at home can give them. We cannot escape the conclusion that to permit American soldiers to stand in dangerous positions abroad without making a major effort to provide adequate air support is inexcusable and terrible negligence. I repeat the question which I have asked innumerable times since the aggression in Korea began: "What are we waiting for?"

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Boston Traveler there appeared an article by Hal Clancy, concerning the proposed reorganization of the Internal Revenue Bureau. This article raises a number of questions which I think Senators will wish to have answered before they commit themselves definitely on the proposed scheme. The article is so interesting and raises so many constructive arguments that I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUIZ FOR TRUMAN ON REVENUE AIMS—LODGE DEMANDS TAX BUREAU DATA

(By Hal Clancy)

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, said today that President Truman is asking Congress to approve his Internal Revenue Bureau reorganization plan without telling what the plan entails.

Lodge said he opposed pig-in-a-poke support of the measure. He said he wanted some details first. He wants to know:

1. Will there be written or oral civil-service examination for commissioners and deputy commissioners—or will they be qualified on so-called unassembled examinations?
2. How many deputy district commissioners will there be?
3. Have any collectors been told they would be district, or deputy district, commissioners?
4. What authority will the district deputies have?
5. What checks will there be on their powers?
6. What qualifications will be required for persons working in the new inspection service?
7. Exactly what authority will the inspection service have? Will it be restricted to investigation of Bureau personnel?
8. Does this new plan necessitate increasing Bureau personnel and budget?
9. In what ways does the President's emergency measure improve on the Hoover committee reform bills which were sponsored before the President acted?

REPLIES DEMANDED

The Senator said the questions stemmed from various allegations which had been brought to his attention during his study of the bill. He said he was not vouching for the accuracy of the reports, but he definitely wanted them answered promptly.

"Obviously, some changes are needed," the hard-hitting Bay State legislator said, "but we cannot proceed on the hysterical assumption that any change is going to be better. As bad as things are, they can always be made worse. We must guard against that."

The complaints and allegations which have been made to the Senator include assertions that—

1. It is planned to qualify commissioners and district commissioners with unassembled examinations—a euphemism for "no examinations." Unassembled exams consist of grading applications on such things as character, reputation, and experience.

WIDE-OPEN JOBS SEEN

If this is true, it is argued, it would be possible to qualify any political favorite providing he didn't have a jail record.

2. It is planned to create up to 70 deputy district commissioners. They would generally approximate the current collectors' offices.

3. Some collectors have been quietly assured they would be made district or deputy district commissioners.

4. That the deputies will control alcohol tax agents, intelligence agents, revenue agents, etc., etc.—everything but agents of the inspection service.

If true, this would provide lush opportunities for corruption and graft. They would have the say over liquor permits for both manufacturing and refining.

ONLY TWO CHECKS

They would have the power to effect compromises with delinquent taxpayers. They would decide whether a taxpayer should be investigated for fraud and whether prosecution should be recommended.

5. There will be only two checks on the deputies—the appellate right and the inspection service. So far as corruption is concerned, the appellate provision means nothing since no taxpayer who gives a bribe is going to appeal the matter.

6. That the inspection service—which, if the above is true, is the only watchdog unit—is run by men with no experience as investigators. They are former auditors, revenue agents, and supervisors of accounts.

7. That the inspection service will be replacing the intelligence unit as the Bureau's independent watchdog, but that it will not have as much power.

UNIT POWERS BROAD

Under the law, it's alleged, the intelligence unit has the right to all records from any source and thus can make what is called a joint investigation—turning up criminal charges while investigating tax returns. This device was used in recent probes.

The inspection service, limited to personnel, would not have this power. It would still be the job of the intelligence units to investigate taxpayers—and intelligence would be under the control of the deputy commissioner.

8. Treasury Secretary Snyder says the Bureau will not have to increase personnel. Budget Director Frederick Lawton says it will.

9. The reorganization bill, sponsored by the President, uses the attractive lure of civil service to win approval—thereby stopping the much broader provisions outlined by the Hoover report and already pending in bills.

Lodge emphasized that he was not setting forth any of the allegations as fact.

"However," he said, "it is deplorable that a measure of such importance should be so vague that there is no information available to confirm or deny such assertions."

RIGHT PERSONS NEEDED

The President's measure will become law automatically in March if the Senate does not vote. It would require 49 votes to defeat it. Twenty-one Senators, not including Lodge, are already sponsors of counter-legislation.

"We cannot forget," LODGE cautioned in summation, "that the President's reorganization bill would freeze control of the Nation's multi-billion-dollar tax structure in the hands of persons chosen by the administration—persons who will be difficult to remove because of their civil-service ratings. They must be the right persons."

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Kentucky, the acting majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I join in that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the unfinished business is the bill proposing that the Territory of Alaska be admitted to statehood. However, from the reports which I have received from Members on both sides of the Chamber, it is evident that it is not likely that today there will be very much discussion, either pro or con, regarding that measure. Unless Members of the Senate have prepared speeches which already have been issued for distribution to the press, they are loath to talk to empty benches.

Senators who have been celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln are now returning to Washington, after an absence of a week, and on about Thursday or Friday, so I am advised, other Members, who wish to honor the memory of Andrew Jackson and other Democratic leaders of the past, will be leaving Washington for the purpose of doing so. Thus I think it may properly be said that these Members on both sides are carrying to the people of the United States the message with respect to their points of view on an event which is expected to transpire in November of this year.

Lest the readers of the RECORD gain the impression from the variety of speeches which are being made during this period that the unfinished business is being overlooked, I merely wish to make it clear that it is not being overlooked, and that the friends of statehood on both sides of the aisle, who are motivated by a purpose which is far above narrow partisanship, are eager and anxious to pursue the unfinished business when suitable audience is provided in the Chamber.

Mr. President, in order to make clear how the supporters of statehood for Alaska and the supporters of statehood for Hawaii are working hand in hand, I desire to read into the RECORD two letters which I have received.

The first of these is from the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, the Delegate in the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1952.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As Alaska's Representative in the Congress of the United States I write this to you shortly before statehood is to be considered by the Senate, to reiterate the deep and sincere belief which has been mine for many years—that is, statehood for Alaska is desirable, necessary and overdue. It should no longer be delayed.

I have never visited Hawaii. But during the various hearings which have been held in the legislative committee of the House of Representatives on the proposition of Hawaii statehood I came to the conclusion that that Territory too has filled all requirements which under the American system must be met by a Territory before it can hope to become a State. I feel so strongly about this that I write this letter principally to convey to you my hope that the Hawaii bill will be enacted into law at this session of Congress. I should hope for that result even if by some mischance Alaska's hopes were not to be realized. We Alaskans want statehood for ourselves but we want it for Hawaii too. We are not striving for position as against Hawaii; we are not jealous in respect to the aspirations of our sister Territory and we shall never adopt a dog-in-the-manger attitude. We wish Hawaii well.

With very best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

The other letter came to me from the Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1952.
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am strongly in favor of statehood for Alaska.

I hope the Senate will adopt the bill reported by your committee for the admission of Alaska to the Union as a State, without regard to what may be done with the bill to give statehood to Hawaii.

I feel that as a matter of national policy it is vital that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted to the Union as States at the present time.

It will, in my opinion, be a tragic mistake if considerations of procedure are allowed to block action on both these bills. I have no preference as to which measure is considered first, and trust that in reaching a decision on this question the Senate will be governed not by partisan considerations but by the merit of the legislation.

In closing, I want to say that we of Hawaii greatly appreciate all you have done to bring this legislation before the Senate. We believe you are performing not only a service to Hawaii but to the country as a whole in the fight you have made in behalf of both Alaska and Hawaii.

Yours sincerely,

J. R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. President, yesterday in the magazine section of the New York Times there was printed a brief article, written by M. B. Schnapper, entitled "About

Alaska—The Territory, once 'Seward's Folly,' Has Long Justified His Statesmanship." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT ALASKA—THE TERRITORY, ONCE "SEWARD'S FOLLY," HAS LONG JUSTIFIED HIS STATESMANSHIP

(By M. B. Schnapper)

Alaska is now again being considered for statehood by Congress. This would certainly astonish a lot of Congressmen of the year 1867. Eighty-five years ago its purchase by the United States for \$7,200,000 was widely derided as just about the most inept deal in real-estate history. It was roughly comparable—but in complete reverse—to the transfer of Manhattan for \$24 worth of trinkets. Times have changed, and also Alaska's value. Today the Territory's intrinsic and strategic worth is rated so high that the Army recently authorized the expenditure of \$167,905,000 (or more than 23 times the original purchase price) for military construction alone there this year and next.

BARGAIN

Alaska was bought from Russia in 1867 by Secretary of State William Seward, and quickly became known as his folly, his icebox, iceberglia, and walrusia. This was scarcely fair to the distinguished Cabinet member, for the idea of buying the land was not really his own—as was, and still is, generally believed. Under President Buchanan in the late 1850's, this country was negotiating with Russia for the Territory, and details of the purchase were being worked out when the Civil War intervened.

It was not, of course, fair in another sense. After the purchase the Government went to work to figure out the size of the Territory, and when it was finally estimated at 375,000,000 acres statisticians discovered that the price came to less than 2 cents an acre. Up to 1944, moreover, the United States had acquired from this supposed worthless wasteland of ice and snow some \$2,500,000,000 worth of natural resources.

KING-SIZE

Alaska is big. Its area of 586,000 square miles makes it twice as large as Texas, almost as large as all the States east of the Mississippi River and—to show how far statisticians will go in these matters—477 times as large as Rhode Island. At its longest and widest points it is longer and wider than the United States proper, and its coastline of 26,000 miles exceeds that of the United States by 3,000 miles.

WONDERLAND

Alaska offers a number of geographical, topographical, and climatic peculiarities. For one thing, far from being a land of eternal snows, less than 3 percent of the entire Territory is continuously covered with snow and ice—despite the fact that its top third lies within the Arctic Circle. Such warm-climate insects as mosquitoes and flies thrive (to the Alaskans' dismay) all through the year.

Other oddities: Embalmed on Alaska's Arctic coast is a sand desert of at least 5,000 square miles, according to the Arctic Institute of North America. Formed by prehistoric winds when the climate was warmer, this desert has sand deposits "tens of feet thick," though frost and vegetation make it difficult to distinguish. One of the natural wonders of the world is the Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, where a countless number—perhaps millions—of hot steam jets shoot out of the earth. The highest point in United States jurisdiction is Alaska's Mount McKinley (20,300 feet).

STRATEGY

Alaska's strategic significance lies in its proximity to Greater Russia, offering a convenient natural doorway to the North American Continent. At one point near the Diomed Islands, United States territory and Siberia are less than a mile apart. During World War II, the Japanese got a foothold in the Aleutian Islands and held it until 1943.

NAMES

Though Juneau is its capital, perhaps Alaska's best known city is Nome, because of its unusual name and the gold rush there after 1899. Originally called Anvil City, it got its name from nearby Cape Nome, which got its name by a mistake. On early maps this point of land was marked simply, "Name." This was carelessly translated into Cape "Nome" because the "a" seemed to resemble an "o," and the misreading stuck.

EFFORTS TO STOP THE ADVANCE OF COMMUNISM IN THE WORLD

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the people of all other countries know that the citizens of the United States are doing their utmost to stop the advance of communism throughout the world.

We are interested in the opinions of officials and persons of other countries about our efforts against communism.

Lately there have come to my attention excerpts from a publication of the Republic of Mexico entitled "A Man of Vision," concerning one of the candidates for the presidency of Mexico, my good friend, Mr. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines. He has described his views concerning communism and President Truman's point 4 program:

COMMUNISM: NO FACTOR IN MEXICO

On the specific point of communism, the candidate was recently asked the direct question: "Do you believe that communism will constitute an important factor in the economy and politics of Mexico in the next 6 years?"

His answer was direct and explicit:

"Not at all. Not politically, nor economically, or even numerically; not in the next 6 years, and I would hope never; because, with the rising trend of our industrial development, and the improvement of agriculture, the masses from which are recruited the workers for the new factories and farms, have been elevated from a former submerged position and a very low-living standard to higher wages and better salaries. This has permitted an expanding scale of well-being never before enjoyed, against which the preachings of the Communists will find no echo.

"The Mexican Revolution, a dynamic national movement projected on heroic scale and based upon fundamental concepts which had their origin in the first decade of this century, has always been inspired by the needs and desires of the Mexican people, and not by imported doctrines, totally alien to our way of thinking.

"In the historical process of development of the Mexican nationality the Revolutionary thesis is a logical and beneficial derivation, not a capricious product of foreign theories.

"The Mexican Revolution has been resolving itself gradually by proper measure effectively fitted to the Mexican reality and to the problems which the Nation has been facing for centuries, problems which were the cause of our past political instability. The revolution, faithful to its historic destiny, will continue by this same route of progress, freedom and justice."

Quoting further:

"In Mexico, we agree in the belief that the best way of combatting communism and its

destructive, antisocial and subversive forces is to improve economic conditions for all who suffer poverty; because it is an established historical experience that hunger, misery, and ignorance offer the most favorable climate for the infiltration and growth of the Communist ideology and influence."

These remarks are truly those of a man of vision—communism will never take hold in Mexico or elsewhere if patriotic men strive to eliminate its twin causes—poverty and ignorance. We can learn much from the example Mexico is setting. Bullets and bombs can never beat communism—ideas and proper living standards can and will.

CONFIRMATION OF DIRECTOR OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the nomination of Ellis G. Arnall, of Georgia, to be Director of Price Stabilization, be confirmed, and that the President be notified immediately. The nomination has been on the desk since Thursday of last week. I have conferred with the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] about the matter, and I understand he has no objection. The nomination was reported unanimously by the committee.

I make this request now for the reason that it is necessary for me to leave the floor in a moment or two in order to attend the hearings of the Subcommittee on Atomic Energy of the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed; and the President will be notified immediately thereof.

LIMITATION OF EXPENDITURES TO ESTIMATED REVENUES

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, while the very distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee is presiding over the Senate, I ask permission to submit a concurrent resolution, and to make a few remarks, which will take about 3 or 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I am submitting at this time needs little explanation as to either its purpose or its necessity.

The purpose of the resolution is to oblige the President to limit Federal expenditures to Federal revenues. The one exception provided is in case of war declared by Congress.

The necessity of curbing Federal expenditures is obvious. It is now, and has been for some time, quite apparent that any steps we may take to curb the spiral of inflation are entirely futile in the face of deficit spending.

Further devaluation of the dollar, due to deficit spending, a greater national debt, and taxes which are destroying the incentive to work and produce, is certain to lead to chaos and an invitation to every enemy within and without our

borders to speed destruction of our form of government and the American Republic as a great power. Deficit spending can be stopped and it must be stopped if we are to remain a free people.

Today our national debt is greater by many billion dollars than the total national debts of all other nations of the world. The relative value of our dollar is decreasing faster than the currency of some European nations to whom we have been giving our substance.

The Congress is requested to appropriate money this year for many foot-in-the-door projects of which the ultimate cost will be from 10 to 20 times the appropriation now requested. All such projects can well wait until our financial house is in order and our defenses secure.

The various committees which have given such splendid service by turning the spotlight on waste, reckless spending, and corruption in the body politic, have given us ample proof that billions of dollars of Federal money have been dissipated in ways which not only tend to injure America financially, but which have a demoralizing effect upon the morale of the Nation as a whole.

The water could be squeezed out of the billions of dollars the budget calls for with cooperation of the executive and legislative branches of our Government. However, if Congress can get no such cooperation it is imperative that it proceed to act with the authority it holds under our constitutional system.

The concurrent resolution I am offering today will serve both the executive and legislative branches of the Government with means to resist pressure groups, and will also serve to a large extent in guiding the work of our appropriation committees.

I trust the Senate will be given an early opportunity to consider the resolution.

Mr. President, since becoming a member of the Appropriations Committee, certain things have more or less distressed me. The committee is confronted with almost continuous authorizations by the Congress, and the members of that committee are therefore requested to appropriate the taxpayers' money in order to meet the obligations involved in such authorizations. It seems to me that this procedure has required us to make appropriations without an opportunity to give sufficient thought to the amount of money which may be available in the Federal Treasury in order to cover the amounts appropriated.

From time to time I have questioned the advisability of formulating a policy, to be acted upon by the House and Senate of the United States, declaring that henceforth it shall be the intention and policy of the Congress to appropriate no more moneys within any given year than the possible revenues which may be made available, except in the direst kind of emergency.

From time to time there have been offered in the House and in the Senate bills, resolutions, amendments, and so forth, with the idea of keeping governmental expenditures within the boundaries of revenues. I commend all the

estimable gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, in each of the Houses of Congress, who have attempted to bring about that objective. To my mind, it would be comparatively simple, if the two Houses would concur in a resolution which would merely define that to be the policy of the Congress. It would help the members of the Appropriations Committee, and it would help the entire Congress to resist the demands of pressure groups for requests of new undertakings.

It would assist the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate to make a clear-cut evaluation of the authorizations which may come before us from time to time.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with our national indebtedness rising almost hourly, it is imperative that the Congress of the United States define and determine upon a policy and diligently and earnestly attempt to follow such a policy.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution is very brief, and I should like to read it:

Whereas continued Federal expenditures in excess of receipts will endanger the economic stability of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should so limit appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, that the total expenditures of the Federal Government during such year will not, except in the event of war hereafter declared by the Congress, exceed the estimated receipts for such fiscal year, as shown in the budget for such fiscal year transmitted to the Congress by the President.

That is very simple, Mr. President, and I believe it would be a guide and would be of great assistance. I think it should receive the approval of the general public.

I should now like to read a short article which was recently released by the Associated Press under a Washington date line, calling attention to our indebtedness and our expenditures:

**BUDGET SPENDING WOULD AMOUNT TO
\$10,000,000 AN HOUR**

WASHINGTON.—Every time the clock ticks off a minute in the next fiscal year, the Government would spend more than \$163,000 under President Truman's new budget—almost \$10,000,000 an hour.

No one would want to tackle it, but let's say you wanted to count out the budget, dollar by dollar—

If you counted a dollar every second for 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, it would take you 11,416 years to do the job.

These are indications of the scope of the \$85,444,000,000 Federal spending program the President proposed to Congress Monday for the year beginning next July 1. Anyway you look at it, it's big.

Here are some other ways of looking at it: The Government would spend as much next fiscal year as it did in the first 136 years of operations, from 1789 through 1925.

It would spend 48 percent more than the \$57,751,000,000 spent in the first full 12 months of World War II.

The budget is bigger than any 2 years' spending, put together, in the first 5 years after World War II. (It's topped only by the two peak years of that war, when spending passed the \$95,000,000,000 mark).

If each dollar bill was laid out, end to end, the total would stretch for more than 8,000,000 miles, more than 240 times around the world at the equator.

The budget is four times bigger than the \$18,514,000,000 spent in the peak year of World War I, and more than two and one-half times as big as the two big spending First World War years put together.

It compares with \$9,183,000,000 spent in the year ending June 30, 1940, before the last defense program started Federal spending rising rapidly.

Mr. President, we have already started hearings on next year's appropriations. After listening to high officials of the Government who have made and are making a study of our indebtedness, our expenditures, and possible receipts, every indication points to the fact that at the end of this year we shall have an additional deficit of \$8,000,000,000. According to the best calculations, at the end of next fiscal year our deficit will increase by another \$14,000,000,000 if we continue to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury to meet the President's recommended budget.

Mr. President, our debt limitation is \$275,000,000,000. This year we have a deficit of \$8,000,000,000, and we shall have a deficit next year of \$14,000,000,000. We shall be, then, within a few million dollars of that debt limitation.

I, for one, believe that the American people realize that we cannot go blindly on and on and on and meet all the requests for expenditures which come before us and, at the same time, expect to balance the budget.

The one thing which it seems to me is more important than all the other issues and problems which confront the Congress is that we do everything within our power as representatives of the people to keep our dollar sound and to assure that our Government will remain in a sound fiscal condition, because if we do not, then all the bloodshed and all the expenditures we have made all over the world will avail us nothing.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. ECTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I compliment the Senator for the able presentation he has made of the subject. He has hit on the most vital subject before the American people today, and he has struck a chord which should find a response not only in the heart and mind and effort of every Senator and Representative, but in the hearts of the American people. In view of the executive department crowding down the throats of the American people and of the American Congress such terrific budgets, the only place to deal with the problem is here in the Congress of the United States.

I think the Senator has highlighted the subject by his resolution and by his remarks today. I compliment him upon his speech, and I think he has performed a real service.

Mr. ECTON. I appreciate the comments of the very able and distinguished minority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. ECTON. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I share the views of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES], because I feel that there is no greater problem facing us today than is the question of deficit spending. In the Reorganization Act there is a provision which calls upon Congress to study this very question and to line up expenditures with income. But that has been disregarded. I hope the resolution offered by the Senator from Montana, calling as it does the matter to our attention once again, may result in something effective being accomplished.

I notice the Senator has included in his resolution the words "except in case of war declared by the Congress." We should also be mindful that in the pending budget of \$85,000,000,000-plus there is no amount designated for the fighting of the Korean war.

Mr. ECTON. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, if the Korean war is to be fought, it is going to be fought only with the use of money over and above the present budget, which would mean a deficit of \$14,400,000,000.

Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. Even though the resolution should not be adopted, I hope we shall all be mindful that the Government should stay within its income, and that only in case of war declared by Congress, as the Senator has indicated, should it be necessary to indulge in deficit spending.

Mr. ECTON. I appreciate the comments by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I am fully aware of his efforts during the years he has been a Member of the Senate, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to do everything within his power to help keep the operations of the Government within estimated revenues.

I share with the Senator his concern about the status of the Government's financial condition, which is at this time fast approaching a critical stage.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana upon the statements he has made reflecting the financial picture which today faces Americans. This is a subject the people of my State are discussing every day.

Nebraska has a debt limitation of \$100,000, which is, of course, ridiculously low. This means that Nebraskans follow the kind of program which the distinguished Senator from Montana is suggesting for the Nation, balancing the out-go with the income annually. That is the only sound principle which can be followed by individuals, by business companies, by corporations, or by nations, if they are to avoid disaster.

I should like to say to the Senator that I shall earnestly support his resolution, because it is in line with one the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I submitted some years ago.

For quite some time a number of Senators have been trying to have a resolution of that sort adopted. I shall do all I can in support of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. ECTON. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Nebraska. I happen to know, from contacts I have in his State, that the senior Senator from Nebraska is recognized as a most substantial, able, sound, and sensible businessman. Many of us have always felt that what is needed is more business in government and not so much government in business.

My able colleague from Nebraska knows that no family, no individual, and no business organization can continually spend beyond its income. If that happens, sooner or later a crack-up will occur. In this country we have seemingly been following a policy which gives the impression, not only to ourselves, but also to people all over the world, that it is perfectly possible to spend ourselves rich; that is, that we can hold ourselves up by our bootstraps and maintain continuous prosperity.

I think it is the judgment of mature, experienced men who are realists that sooner or later there will have to be a showdown. When the Government has an income of approximately \$75,000,000-000 each year, it seems to me that, if we exercise proper diligence, it is perfectly possible to do the things which are necessary within such a budget, without ever exceeding the debt limit, and without further devaluating the Nation's worth or the worth of the American dollar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Montana for the splendid contribution he is making in this time of great need. The resolution which the Senator offers should be supported wholeheartedly by all of us. The contribution he has made by his able remarks today should be heeded by every Member of the Senate. I trust his views will be supported 100 percent by all his colleagues.

I hope the Senator from Montana will permit me to associate myself not only with the resolution he is offering, but also with his views on what I think is one of the most vital subjects before the American people today—the American tax dollar and its value in our scheme of things.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I appreciate his remarks and his desire to be associated with me in presenting this concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I send the concurrent resolution to the desk and ask that it be referred to the proper committee.

I may also state that if any of my colleagues desire to join with me in offering the concurrent resolution, I shall be pleased to have them do so, and I ask that the clerk receive their names.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to add my name to the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for desiring to have their names added to the concurrent resolution at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have my name included also.

Mr. ECTON. I am happy to have added the name of our distinguished and able minority leader, the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 62), submitted by Mr. ECTON (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. HENDRICKSON) was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on January 31 I described the activities of the International Materials Conference. I exposed, for the first time, how this fantastic brain-child of our State Department was robbing thousands of American workers of their jobs, and threatening the jobs of thousands of additional workers by refusing to permit American industry to buy the copper necessary to maintain our standard of living. I said that it was fantastic that this administration had usurped the power to lower our standard of living.

Again, on Monday, February 4, I exposed the activities of this same organization in connection with zinc, lead, sulphur, cotton, tungsten, molybdenum, manganese, nickel, cobalt, and paper, vital raw materials. I described how this international body decrees our "entitlement for consumption"—the words "entitlement for consumption" are in quotation marks because that is how this international body actually controls materials—and how this ceiling on our ability to consume raw material is responsible for the unemployment of thousands of Americans.

I then requested that the Secretary of State reveal by what authority and by what law we participate in this international cartel. I asked him whether or not American consumers were consulted before we were bound to the decisions of this conference, and, finally, I demanded that the elected representatives of the people, in other words, the Congress of the United States, be consulted before committing us further to the decisions of this international body.

On February 6, according to the Associated Press, a spokesman for the State Department declared that the International Materials Conference is a "useful, voluntary arrangement with no binding effect on the United States or other governments." On the same date, in a press conference, Mr. Manly Fleischmann, the

Defense Production Administrator, stated:

Whatever the advantages or disadvantages of the International Materials Conference, they should not be charged to the State Department.

He claimed that we are participating under the President's authority to conduct foreign affairs.

What does he mean when he says that we are participating under the President's authority to conduct foreign affairs? Whom does he mean by "we"? Where and when did Defense Production Administration officials get the impression that the Defense Production Administration was authorized to "participate in the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country"? The foreign affairs of this country are in the hands of the President, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate, and not with the advice and consent of the Defense Production Administration. I have again examined the Defense Production Act, and I have failed to find any provision in the act which authorizes the Defense Production Administration to participate in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

I am positive that the Senate did not contemplate participation in foreign affairs when it confirmed the nomination of the Defense Production Administrator for his present post.

I received an official answer from the State Department dated February 7, written by Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary. The essential parts of his answer are as follows:

The International Materials Conference is the collective title applied to seven autonomous commodity committees, a central group, and a secretariat, which were organized early in 1951, at the initiative of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France.

The International Materials Conference was established to provide a framework of international consultation in which the major producing and consuming countries of the free world could . . . develop agreed measures for equitable distribution of the available supplies (of raw materials).

The authority for the participation of the United States in this conference is the authority of the President to negotiate with other countries in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States. The International Materials Conference has no authority to tell any government what it may or may not do with respect to any material.

Each committee has developed its own rules of procedure and has the power to revise its membership.

A country might join a committee if it is sponsored by two members and if it receives a favorable vote. The first task of an International Materials Conference committee is to accumulate and review the facts of supply and demand. The committees therefore circulate questionnaires on requirements, production, consumption, and stocks to all countries which are significant producers or consumers. If an examination of the facts in the committees shows a substantial disparity between available supplies and the requirements of the free world for defense and essential civilian purposes, the committees recommend a plan of equitable distribution.

Countries which are members of a committee are, of course, active in presenting their own requirements. Countries which

are not members of a committee are given the opportunity to appear before the committee and explain their requirements. If a country thinks that the committee has not given proper weight to its requirements, it is entitled to appeal the decision and to ask that the matter be reopened in the committee.

Controversies in the committees are not normally resolved by voting. In every case the purpose is to reach general agreement and, if possible, to have unanimous acceptance of a committee recommendation.

Since no country has delegated any authority to the International Materials Conference, it would clearly be impossible to accomplish effective collaboration on the distribution of an item in short supply if any important country concerned was not disposed to cooperate and to consider the committee recommendations to be of service to its own interests.

The chief United States delegate to the International Materials Conference is an official of the Defense Production Administration. He is responsible for determination of the position of the United States with respect to any question before the International Materials Conference Committees.

In developing this position, he receives the advice of all interested agencies, including the Department of State among others.

To digress a moment from the quotation, we should underscore the words:

In developing this position, he receives the advice of all interested agencies, including the Department of State among others.

We note that he is not interested in getting the advice of the consumer of the material, or the working people. He is interested only in getting the advice of the agencies.

Continuing with the quotation from the letter:

The United States delegates to the individual commodity committees come from a number of agencies. They are selected on the basis of their qualifications for conducting the negotiations and for their knowledge and background in the specific commodity. They receive their instructions from the Defense Production Administration, and they are answerable to the Defense Production Administration for the results of their negotiations. Formal action by the Government of the United States in accepting a recommendation of an International Materials Conference Committee is taken by the Defense Production Administration, with the advice of the interested agencies. In each case in which a proposal for distribution has been accepted by the United States, the supply authorities have been satisfied that the share received by the United States has been fair.

If I may interpolate, who is to determine what is fair to the United States?

Coming back to the letter:

You have inquired concerning consultation with consuming industries in the United States, and have made a number of comments on the relationship of International Materials Conference allocations to domestic needs. I understand that Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, has covered most of these points in his press conference of February 6.

It would appear that we are becoming a government of press conferences.

From the last paragraph which I read and the previous statement that "in developing this position, he receives the advice of all interested agencies, including

the Department of State among others," it is apparent that this is not considered an important matter. The statement clearly shows that consumer, labor, and industry groups were not consulted. It appears that we have come to the point where only government is consulted, and, further, that they undertake to answer some of these important points only in a press conference.

As I stated the other day, the press releases now number almost a hundred. Only a little bit of information comes out at a time. Consequently, newspapers must wade through a tidal wave of press releases which are issued every day. It is almost impossible, therefore, for a newspaper or other media of news to search out or ferret out the vital points in such a mass of press releases.

I charged that the International Materials Conference is a cartel designed to allocate the raw materials of the world and influence their prices. Mr. Thorp's letter confirms every statement I made. The State Department does not take issue with any the facts I presented to the Senate.

Perhaps it may be well at this point, Mr. President, to refer to dictionary definition of a cartel. The Funk & Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary defines the word as "a combination or clubbing together as of political or commercial interests." The International Materials Conference, as described in Mr. Thorp's letter, fits this description.

I am sure the sponsors of the International Materials Conference believe it is a beneficial organization, but everyone engaged in cartel activities believes he is doing the right thing. Where private citizens are involved, the Sherman Act does not distinguish between good and bad trusts. It matters not that the parties believe they are doing something good in forming a trust. The law does not distinguish between the good and bad trusts. It is the trust itself that is struck down.

Mr. Thorp's letter says:

The first task of an International Materials Conference Committee is to accumulate and review the facts of supply and demand. The committees, therefore, circulate questionnaires on requirements, production, consumption, and stocks to all countries which are significant producers or consumers. If an examination of the facts in the committees shows a substantial disparity between available supplies and the requirements of the free world for defense and essential civilian purposes, the committees recommend a plan of equitable distribution.

This statement in the files of any trade organization engaging in these same purposes would be sufficient to secure a criminal conviction under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Mr. President, there can be no question that Mr. Thorp's letter creates an international cartel. As I stated, if any group of corporations puts the same statement on paper, it would be sufficient to secure a criminal conviction under the Sherman antitrust law. Apparently the Government is not subject to the law of the land.

I said there was no statutory authority for our participation in the International-

al Materials Conference. This has not been denied. The State Department letter says:

The authority for the participation of the United States in this conference is the authority of the President to negotiate with other countries in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

The Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. McFall, in a letter to Representative BUDGE on January 24 said:

There is no specific statutory authority for the participation of the United States in this Conference as it is one of the many activities carried out in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

The Defense Production Administration officials claim their agency is participating under the "President's authority to conduct foreign affairs." So there can be no disputing the fact that there is no statutory authority for the International Materials Conference.

The President does have the constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs but this has never been stretched to include the determination of the living standards of all the nations of the world including those of every American citizen. Only in a completely Socialist state would the power to conduct foreign affairs be interpreted to include power to regulate entitlements for consumption to its citizens.

As I said before, the spokesman for the State Department declared that the International Materials Conference is a "useful, voluntary arrangement with no binding effect on the United States or other governments." Let us examine this statement:

Useful, indeed. Useful to whom? Useful to the families of unemployed workers? Useful in lowering our standard of living? Or is it useful in "easing the problems of friendly consuming countries"—to use the words of the Defense Mobilizer.

The State Department spokesman also said that the International Materials Conference is a "voluntary arrangement"—that we voluntarily agreed to restrict our consumption to the decisions of this international body.

Let us underscore and examine the words "voluntary arrangement." Who, may I ask, is the volunteer? Did the American consumer volunteer? Did the unemployed auto worker volunteer? Did his family volunteer? Did the Congress of the United States volunteer, or did Government officials volunteer? I demand that the volunteers step forward and be identified so that all others may see who it is that is voluntarily throwing thousands of American workers out on the streets.

The United States is represented in the International Materials Conference by a deputy administrator of the Defense Production Administration, who is listed in the Congressional Directory as being in charge of International Material Activities. His decisions in accepting an "entitlement for consumption" for all the citizens of the United States is, I am sure, a voluntary one on his part. However, after he accepts an entitlement for consumption on behalf

of the citizens of the United States, the voluntary nature of the program is ended, for in the words of the International Materials Conference, "in accepting the distribution plans, governments assume the responsibility for seeing that their allocations are not exceeded."

I have established the fact that there is no statutory authority for the International Materials Conference nor for Defense Production Administration acceptance of these entitlements for consumption on behalf of United States citizens.

Nevertheless, once our representative has accepted an entitlement for consumption, the Government of the United States uses its statutory authority to limit our consumption to that entitlement through the Defense Production Administration.

I have shown you, Mr. President, through releases of the International Materials Conference, that this international group has given us a specific ceiling on the amount of copper which we are entitled to consume. For the fourth quarter of 1951, this entitlement to consumption was slightly less than 334,000 metric tons. Now I call your attention to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Defense Production, dated January 6, 1952. This report states:

In order to bring the demand for copper products in balance with supply, the Defense Production Administration has allotted 1,367,000,000 pounds of copper products (including the metal weight of scrap and alloys) to the various claimant agencies, or about 110 percent of the estimated supply.

If we eliminate the secondary copper from this figure, about 40 percent of the total supply, we find that this allotment was based on the availability of about 338,000 metric tons of primary copper. The difference between the Defense Production Administration allotment and the International Materials Conference entitlement is less than 1 percent of the amount given to us as an entitlement for consumption by the International Materials Conference. There can be no doubt, then, that the entitlement for consumption given us by the International Materials Conference completely determines the amount of copper allocated by the Defense Production Administration, and that, therefore, the Defense Production Administration is in reality putting the force of law behind the so-called voluntary agreement. The limitations on the consumption of copper imposed by the Defense Production Administration are necessary in order to prevent American industry from embarrassing our Government internationally. The real purpose of the controlled materials plan, then, is to make sure that in total we do not consume more copper than we have been allotted by the International Materials Conference.

Unfortunately our "entitlement for consumption" is not large enough to meet all the demands for copper in the United States, and therefore the Government says it becomes necessary to place a limit on the amount we may consume. This is done through the controlled materials plan. Each copper

consumer is given a controlled materials plan allocation by the Defense Production Administration and, by law, is prohibited from using any more copper than this allocation allows. American industry has the ingenuity and the ability to find all the copper it needs in order to be able to build all the things our people want and to put all our people back to work. However, after having found the copper, American industry is prohibited by the Defense Production Administration from using it.

Mr. President, representatives of a large corporation which manufactures supplies for electric power companies said in conversation with me that if their corporation had a copper mine, and if they were to dig the copper, they would not be allowed to use it unless their allotment of copper was reduced by the number of pounds of copper which they mined in that way. Think of it, Mr. President. A corporation which has copper it can use in order to keep its employees at work cannot use the copper, because of this controlled materials plan, unless the corporation surrenders the same number of pounds of copper from the amount it was to receive under its allocation.

The International Materials Conference then is, as I charged, an international cartel and a trust organized by the United States Government.

The members of this international cartel determine the supplies of raw materials and then divide the available supply among all the nations of the free world on the basis of need, as determined by these representatives. The commodity groups control their own membership. As Mr. Thorp said in his letter to me:

A country may join a committee if it is sponsored by two members and if it receives a favorable vote—if a (nonmember) country thinks that the committee has not given proper weight to its requirements it is entitled to appeal the decision.

Therefore, Mr. President, the International Materials Conference is an unauthorized supergovernment.

If this is a voluntary program, as alleged, why should a nonmember government have to appeal a decision, and to whom do they appeal? Mr. President, if either you or I belong to an organization that is entirely voluntary, its acts are not binding on us, and we do not need to have a right of appeal.

But in the present case, 12 countries, constituting the copper committee of the International Materials Conference, determine the entitlements for consumption of copper for 40 countries. Not all these countries are engaged in the production of defense products; many of them produce no guns, tanks, airplanes, or weapons of any kind. The countries receiving entitlements include many neutrals in the present world conflict.

No, Mr. President, this is not a defense plan; it is a socialistic scheme to raise living standards in other lands by lowering the American standard of living.

During World War II we had the controlled-materials plan and international allocation of raw materials among the allies. I raised no protest at that time. All the countries concerned were at war, and all of them concentrated on the production of war matériel. There was no production of civilian goods using metal. Today we have a different problem. Most of the materials being allocated are used for civilian needs. The International Materials Conference is planning living standards, not defense. Certainly this is not the business of the Defense Production Administration. Its business is defense production.

Mr. President, I told the Senate that 3,000 tons of copper would prevent unemployment for 65,000 workers in the automobile industry in the second quarter of this year. This is merely an example, one dramatic incident in the Nation-wide picture, which has resulted from the International Materials Conference. Unfortunately, it is not the only example and perhaps not even the best one, for the International Materials Conference allocations have resulted in thousands of unemployed workers in New York, New England, and many other sections of the country—not to mention the effect in the many other civilian industries and businesses using copper and other minerals.

Copper is available in the world market at prices higher than those our domestic producers are allowed to charge. The American taxpayer is being forced to provide, through the Mutual Security Agency, sufficient funds to enable foreign nations to pay these higher copper prices.

American industry, however, is effectively barred from paying these higher prices and from using this currently available copper, which they need to prevent the unemployment of their workers. First of all, the OPS refuses to recognize these higher world copper prices in setting domestic price ceilings; but secondly, and much more importantly, the Defense Production Administration refuses to allow American producers permission to use this copper. For example, the automobile manufacturers have been told that they may build 930,000 cars in the second quarter of 1952, but the Defense Production Administration has restricted the amount of copper they may use to the amount necessary to build only 800,000 cars.

In other words, Mr. President, lip service is given to the people of the United States; the officials of the Defense Production Administration say that the manufacturers of automobiles can build 930,000 automobiles in the second quarter of the present year, but in the next breath the officials of that Government agency say, "But we are going to allow you to have only enough copper to build 800,000 automobiles." Think of it, Mr. President. The industry can easily obtain the additional copper necessary to build the other 130,000 cars, but they cannot get permission from the Defense Production Administration to

use it. If they were to buy the necessary additional copper in the world market, the Defense Production Administration would deduct this available free-world copper from their copper allotments, thereby reducing their total consumption of copper to the amount necessary to build only the 800,000 cars. In other words, Mr. President, even if one of the companies had the copper stored conveniently in its own plant, it would not be able to use it; it would only be allowed to use it to the extent that the whole industry could build 800,000 cars.

Therefore, every ton of copper purchased by American industry in the free-world market is immediately deducted from their already inadequate copper allotment. Does this sound like a voluntary agreement? Does it sound as though American industry had agreed to this international scheme? Does it sound as though the Congress had agreed to this scheme? Has the American producer voluntarily given up his right to keep his workers employed, or should he voluntarily go to jail for violating the rules of the Defense Production Administration?

I have before me an offer from a copper broker in New York, to supply as much as 1,000 tons of copper from Japan at 45 cents a pound, free on board Japan, with an indication that an additional 7,000 tons is available. There is nothing unique about this offer. There is copper in the world market. Employers in the United States are willing to pay the higher price, but they are prohibited from using this copper by the Defense Production Administration. The Defense Production Administration must prohibit the use of this copper, because our Government is bound by a voluntary agreement to restrict our copper usage to the amount allocated to us by the International Materials Conference.

If the American companies were to buy the Japanese copper, it might mean that other countries would be unable to get all the copper allocated to them by the International Materials Conference. For example, India is not a member of NATO, and has frequently voted against the United States on crucial issues in the United Nations. India is also a country which is not producing one gun or one tank, but it has been given a very liberal entitlement for consumption by the International Materials Conference. In fact, India has been given an entitlement for consumption which is more than twice its 1947 actual consumption. All of this copper for India is for the production of civilian goods designed to raise the standard of living of the natives of India. I want to help the Indian people raise their standard of living, but not at the expense of the American workingman, and not at the expense of war production here at home.

It should be clear, then, that the purpose of the International Materials Conference is to protect the other nations of the world against the normal competition of citizens of the United States who are trying to maintain their standard of living and to defend themselves and others. The International Materials Conference puts an umbrella over many nations, including neutrals. The Inter-

national Materials Conference is thus concerned with a redistribution of the world's living standards, rather than with a mobilization of the resources of the free world for defense. I, for one, shall never protest against any measure designed to promote the defense of our institutions, but I challenge, and I shall continue to fight, the use of powers delegated by the Congress for the defense of these institutions, in a scheme of global planning totally unrelated to defense.

According to the Wall Street Journal, the Defense Production Administrator also maintained that—

The copper allocation earmarked for the United States in the first quarter by the International Materials Conference is larger than the amount this country could expect to get in the free market.

I charge that this is completely untrue. The International Materials Conference does not earmark copper for the United States, but, rather, issues an entitlement for consumption, and demands that the United States agree not to consume more than this entitlement. I charge further that American producers, if unshackled by the Defense Production Administrator, would get the needed copper.

The Defense Production Administrator also said that "high foreign prices are preventing the United States from actually getting delivery of all the copper assigned to it." Again, I hear that this is not true. The high foreign prices, which we subsidize through our taxes, by Mutual Security Agency grants, admittedly, are unfair and unjust—particularly when the OPS will not permit American producers to reflect the higher prices in price ceilings—but these high prices are not the reason for our copper shortage. American copper consumers are willing to pay the high prices, if it means getting their employees back to work, but they are prevented from using the copper they could buy in the world market, by regulations of the Defense Production Administration.

Mr. Fleischmann said, finally:

It is better to have price ceilings and lose some copper than to bid up prices.

In other words, the Defense Production Administration feels that it is better to have workers walking the streets than to pay a slightly higher price for a small amount of copper. Sometimes, Mr. President, the copper is insignificant when compared to manhours, the amount of labor, and the cost of material. Perhaps those in charge of the Defense Production Administration would change their mind if they were among the unemployed.

On Monday, February 4, I showed how the International Materials Conference was planning to control other commodities. I said that cotton, cotton linters, manganese, and wool were under review. At the very moment when I was speaking, the International Materials Conference was preparing press release No. 59, issued on February 4, which announced:

A plan of distribution of primary nickel for the first quarter of 1952 has been established by the Manganese, Nickel, and Cobalt Committee of the International Materials Conference.

It also said, and I quote:

The committee's recommendations have been forwarded to all interested governments for immediate implementation.

If this is a voluntary agreement, and if the Secretary of State is the volunteer, then I demand that he immediately withdraw from the International Materials Conference, and that the Defense Production Administration immediately give American producers permission to buy the copper they need anywhere, at any place, at any price. If this is not done immediately, then the responsibility for unemployment in the United States will continue to rest entirely on the administration.

I replied to Mr. Thorp's letter in a telegram to Secretary Acheson on Saturday, February 10, demanding that these restrictions be lifted. My telegram was as follows:

I have your reply of February 7 in answer to my questions about the International Materials Conference. Your letter was given to me as I was leaving Washington. You state:

"The International Materials Conference has no authority to tell any government what it may or may not do with respect to any material. The International Materials Conference can only develop agreement among the representatives of countries that they will recommend that their governments take specific action to solve urgent problems. The governments retain their full right to reject these recommendations."

May I remind you, Mr. Secretary, that Michigan has an urgent problem. We have thousands of unemployed auto workers, and 65,000 additional workers are threatened with unemployment. To solve this urgent problem, I demand that our Government reject the recommendations of the International Materials Conference because I am convinced that the Government's acceptance of these recommendations is responsible for the unemployment in Michigan.

I demand that the Government immediately give the automobile industry permission to use enough material to relieve the present unemployment and to prevent the future unemployment of 65,000 additional automobile workers.

If it is true that the International Materials Conference has no authority and if it is true that our Government can reject their recommendations, then there is no reason why it should not do so, and relieve this unemployment. This will require so little additional scarce materials in comparison to the hardships of unemployment that there is no further defense in the light of your statement for permitting a continuation of this unjustifiable situation. The copper is available in the world market, and I am sure that the automobile industry will find the necessary copper if given permission to use it. At the present time the Defense Production Administration has refused to give the industry permission to use enough copper to build what cars they are authorized to build. I am convinced that this refusal is based on the commitments made to the International Materials Conference.

If our Government has the authority to reject those commitments I urge it do so immediately. This will permit the reemployment of our Michigan workers.

HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator.

To date I have received only this reply:

FEBRUARY 14, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Your telegram of February 10 has been received relating to copper, the International Materials Con-

ference, and the unemployment situation in Michigan. Since the United States participation in the International Materials Conference, as well as the distribution of available copper supplies, is in the hands of the Defense Production Administration, I am forwarding your suggestions to Mr. Fleischmann.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD L. THORP.

The people of Michigan elected me to protect their interests and the interests of all other United States citizens. I have sworn to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States which include the Sherman Antitrust Act, designed to assure the survival of free competitive enterprise. I have not been elected by the citizens of any foreign country to raise their standard of living at the expense of the American people. Our Government has within its hands the power to reject this International Materials Conference if it is a voluntary arrangement. This action would immediately relieve unemployment in Michigan and in other States by simply permitting employers in the United States to buy copper when and where they can find it. Therefore, until the administrators of the Government see fit to make this simple, obvious decision, I have no alternative but to report to the Senate and to the unemployed workers the facts and the cause of unemployment in Michigan and elsewhere in the United States.

GREETING TO FOUR COEQUAL WINNERS OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, through the years this Chamber has been visited by many distinguished persons. Today we have four visitors who, in my opinion, have never been outranked at any time by any of the visitors who have honored us by their presence. I refer to the winners of the "I Speak for Democracy" contest, a contest which is cosponsored by the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, with the Radio and Television Manufacturers Association and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. The contest is endorsed by the United States Office of Education. The honorary chairman is the Honorable Thomas C. Clark, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, these four contestants represent schools, public and parochial, 30,000 in number, throughout the United States. In the contest there were more than a million entries. The four persons to whom I have referred were selected as the winners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point further details with respect to the Voice of Democracy contest, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the four very outstanding 5-minute addresses of these young people.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8.—Four young high-school students from Colorado, Iowa, Louisiana, and New York have been

selected as the four coequal winners of the fifth annual Voice of Democracy contest.

The selections of the national judges were announced today by Robert K. Richards, chairman of the National Voice of Democracy Committee, and Director of Public Affairs for the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, which annually cosponsors the broadcast competition with the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. It is endorsed by the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. Associate Justice Tom C. Clark, of the United States Supreme Court, is serving again as honorary national chairman.

The four winners from a field of over 1,000,000 contestants throughout the United States are Dwight Clark, Jr., 18, Fort Collins High School senior, Fort Collins, Colo.; Mara Gay Masselink, 15, Burlington High School junior, Burlington, Iowa; George A. Frilot, III, 17, Jesuits High School senior, New Orleans, La.; Thaddeus S. Zolkiewicz, 17, Canisius High School senior, Buffalo, N. Y.

The radio stations sponsoring the winners are: KCOL, Fort Collins, Colo., Ellis Atterberry, general manager; KBUR, Burlington, Iowa, G. M. McDermott, president-general manager; WWL, New Orleans, La., W. H. Summerville, general manager; and WBEN, Buffalo, N. Y., C. Robert Thompson, general manager.

The winners, who wrote and voiced the best 5-minute broadcast scripts on the subject, I Speak for Democracy, today are looking forward to a trip to Washington, D. C., for awards week. They are being brought to the Nation's Capital by the sponsors, and while in Washington will meet the President of the United States, Members of Congress and the Supreme Court, and other high government and military leaders and visit the historic points of interest. At the annual awards luncheon on Washington's Birthday, Friday, February 22, at the Statler Hotel, each will receive a \$500 college scholarship, their choice of radio or television receivers and other prizes. Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, will preside at the awards luncheon and the scholarships will be presented to the students by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine.

The youngsters will also broadcast to the youth of the world over radio-television networks and the Voice of America.

The winners, scheduled to arrive in Washington on Thursday, February 14, will be taken to Williamsburg, Va., the cradle of democracy, for the week end of February 15-18 as honored guests of John D. Rockefeller III, and the Williamsburg Foundation, while there they will participate in appropriate ceremonies commemorating the founding of our democratic government.

The panel of outstanding Americans who judged the finalists and selected the national winners was comprised of: Joseph B. Chaplin, president, National Association of Secondary School Principals; Wayne Coy, chairman, Federal Communications Commission; the Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Washington, D. C.; Harold E. Fellows, president, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; Senator James W. Fulbright of Arkansas; Miss Jan Geister, winner, 1947-48 Voice of Democracy contest; Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Seymour N. Siegel, president, National Association of Educational Broadcasters; Senator Smith; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; Glen McDaniel, president, Radio-Television Manufacturers Association.

This panel, like those at the State and regional levels, judged the winners by means

of transcriptions identified only by code number so that the judges did not know the identity of the contestants.

The 1951-52 Voice of Democracy Contest opened last October in conjunction with National Radio and Television Week. Tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade students of approximately 30,000 public, private, and parochial schools across the Nation and in the Territories first listened to model addresses by eminent Americans and broadcast over the Nation's radio stations. Then each contestant wrote his own 5-minute broadcast script. School and community eliminations followed, and State winners were determined from the transcriptions of the community winners.

Broadcasters, radio-television distributors and dealers and United States Junior Chamber of Commerce chapters throughout the United States cooperated to arrange for the contests and prizes in the schools, communities, and States. The transcriptions of the State and Territorial winners were sent to national contest headquarters in Washington, D. C., where the National VOD Committee auditioned them to select the 12 finalists.

The finalists' transcriptions were then delivered to the national judges for the selection of the four winners.

The selection of the New Orleans winner in the final four makes the second consecutive year in which Louisiana has been represented by a national winner. Colorado this year also produced its second national winner since the origination of the competition. The State had a winner in the 1949-50 contest.

Described by United States Commissioner of Education McGrath as the contest for high schools, the 1951-52 Voice of Democracy Contest has been one of the most successful since the competition started. The first Voice of Democracy Contest in 1947-48 attracted some 30,000 students from 28 States. This year, for the second time in a row, the entries soared to more than a million from throughout the country and its possessions.

(By Dwight Clark, Jr., age 18, Fort Collins High School, Fort Collins, Colo.)

He ruled during the Golden Age of Athens, 450 years before the time of Christ. His name? Pericles. A man who said:

"We are happy in a form of government which cannot envy the laws of our neighbors, for it has served as a model to others, and is original at Athens. This, our form, is committed not to the few but to the whole body of the people. It is called a democracy."

That was the voice of Pericles. He spoke for democracy.

Utopia was the name used by Sir Thomas More, the greatest intellect in his nation during the sixteenth century. And a wonderful nation this Utopia was, for it believed in free universal education, the right of every citizen to help choose his governmental representatives, an 8, or even 6-hour day for the laboring man, a policy of aversion to war, and complete freedom in choosing one's own religion. Sir Thomas More believed in these rights, and he tried to tell the world about them. He spoke for democracy.

While the greatest democracy the world has ever known, America, was just getting under way, a Frenchman—in fact, the military genius of the French Revolution, was speaking immortal words for democracy. His name: Lazarre Nicholas Carnot. His words:

"Only once was the labor of philosophy calmly organized. That Republic, the United States of America, full of wisdom and of strength, exhibits this phenomenon, and each day their prosperity shows an increase which astonishes other nations. Thus it is

reserved for the New World to teach the Old that just existence is possible and peaceable under the rule of liberty and equality."

America was just hacking out a foothold when Lazarre Nicholas Carnot spoke those words. He spoke for democracy.

Now listen to the words of a contemporary, a man of God. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has a remarkable ability of shortening his ideas into brief sentences. Listen:

"Democracy is based on the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people."

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick—he spoke of democracy.

Four men, from four generations; one, the leader of Athens, the world's first great democracy; the second, from the English Renaissance; the third, a keyman in the French Revolution; fourth, a man of God, living now in the world's second great democracy.

They were big men, powerful men, leaders of their age. They spoke for democracy. But now, may I speak for democracy? For I'm a product of that experiment in living. I'm like the average Athenian Pericles was so proud of. I'm a citizen in Sir Thomas More's Utopia. I come from the democratic nation that Carnot praised so highly. I'm one of those ordinary people that Harry Emerson Fosdick has faith in.

Look at my life—see why I should speak for democracy. Born in 1934; average family. Father: Business manager of a local newspaper; a newspaper that said what it honestly believed on the issues of the day. Mother: A former school teacher, whose curriculum was not limited or dictated by our Government. I joined a church; the church I wanted to join, out of 250 possible denominations. Our family moved West, without need of Government passport or permission. My father became a small-business man, selling in competition with other men, just like him, in our community.

I'm 18 now, completing 12 years of free education, because the citizens of this Nation believe that everyone must be able to understand the basic complexities of our modern world.

And in the future, I can continue my education. I can choose my life work. I can be mayor, governor, Congressman, or President. I can live in happiness and security. All this, and more, makes me the luckiest person in the world today—because I live in a democracy.

Yes; Pericles, More, Carnot, Fosdick, and I. We—we speak for democracy.

(By Thaddeus Stanislaus Zolkiewicz, age 17, Canisius High School, Buffalo, N. Y.)

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, the sound of shells and bombs seems far away. Tonight is the kind of night when one could lean back his chair and completely relax; tonight is the kind of night when one could forget his troubles, and roam throughout the magic realms of the land of imagination and never want to return. For you see, tonight is a night for dreaming, and I can't help but wonder if it wasn't on a night like this, a night for dreaming, that the dream of democracy was first begun.

Democracy—it isn't a harsh word. It doesn't stand for oppression, or greed, or hate. No, it's a good word; it stands for good things.

Democracy, what does it stand for? The landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock, the bloody Revolution, the bloodier Civil War, a good many wars fought to keep it free and clear of the mire of oppression, heroes, champions of democracy, brave men, all of them shedding their blood, giving the last full measure of their devotion to a cause that deserved it, for democracy not only deserves to be loved, but in a sense demands to be loved and fought for, if need be, if it is to remain.

Democracy, great wars and a good many battlefields, too—Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, Bull Run, Gettysburg—and "Fourscore and seven years ago, our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Argonne Forest, Rouge Bouquet, and Joyce Kilmer's—

"In a wood they call the Rouge Bouquet

There is a new-made grave today.
Built by never a spade nor pick
Yet covered with earth ten meters thick.
There lie many fighting men,
Dead in their youthful prime,
Never to laugh nor love again
Nor taste the summertime.
For death came flying through the air
And stopped his flight at the dugout stair,
Touched his prey and left them there,
Clay to clay."

Corregidor, Tarawa, Anzio, and now Taejon, Suwon, the thirty-eighth parallel.

Democracy, great statesmen, great achievements.

Democracy, the millions of little things that lie nestled close to our hearts—the rustle of wind through tree, the ripple of cool streams running beside virgin forests, baby's first steps, your son's first touchdown, your daughter's first date, small things, perhaps, but big to you, big in a democracy.

Democracy, the millions of poems and stories and songs of the land, songs like—

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.
Land of the Pilgrims' pride,
Land where my fathers died, from every
mountainside,
Let freedom ring."

Democracy, freedom of the press and of speech, freedom of religion. "From every mountainside, let freedom ring."

Yet perhaps it was on a night like this, a night for dreaming, that the dream of democracy was begun. But one thing is certain, and that is that democracy is a dream no longer. It's here, it's living, it's in the air we breathe, the thoughts we think, it beats within us with every throb of our hearts, it speaks when we speak, it's real, it's no dream, it's democracy.

(By George A. Frilot III, age 17, Jesuits' High School, New Orleans, La.)

This is the voice of tyranny, speaking for democracy. I feel that I can speak for democracy, for I have known it since my first existence—known it as an enemy. I have hated democracy, and I have fought it. I have been the aggressor. I have routed armies and enslaved nations. I have plundered homes, seized fortunes, and from millions, I have taken life. But I have failed. History will curse my name. I have learned my lesson, and learned it the hard way.

But the memory of my past will forever haunt me. I need but look back a few years, to a time when I had seized power in a free country, by a free ballot.

The place was Germany; the year was 1933. The rights and liberties of 80,000,000 people were jeopardized, but no one would act decisively. It was here that I began my work in the personage of Adolph Hitler. I had Hitler persuade Hindenberg that the country could be saved only if he, the leader of the Nazi Party, were appointed Chancellor of Germany. By means of lies and treachery, it was accomplished. But I was not securely in power. Hitler's party did not have a majority in the Reichstag. So, a week before the 1933 elections, the Reichstag building was burned down. Hitler blamed his opposition—and the country believed him. It was 5 days later that the German people marched up to the polls, and

by an overwhelming majority gave Hitler and his party control of Germany. My reign had begun. I ruled Germany with a dictatorship, and I had gained my rule by the free vote of a free people. I had conquered Germany from within her bounds, and I had done so through the legal ballot of an irresponsible electorate.

There is no time now, no need, to recount the tragic story of what Hitlerism has since meant to Germany and to the world. It has been told and retold in the free press everywhere. It has been written in blood over the face of the world.

Think, America, think of it. You live in a democracy. There is no absolute power packed into the hands of an individual. Yours is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. Yours is the finished product of western civilization. Your democracy has been founded on respect for the dignity of the human person. It means equal opportunity for all. It means the full enjoyment of every civil liberty—freedom of worship, of speech, of press, and of election. It means a Government that is the servant of the people, not its master.

But you have taken too many things for granted. If only your family were suddenly transferred to a country ruled by me, tyranny, you would realize how essential these taken-for-granted rights are. You would find life a long nightmare of lingering fear—fear of the consequences of an impulsive word or even a timid remark; fear that a forbidden book might be found in your possession; fear that something you had done which was lawful yesterday might be a crime tomorrow, and one for which you would be tried in a secret court, without jury, without witnesses, without hope of acquittal.

You have the Bill of Rights. It secures the free ground you tread, the free air you breathe. There is not an instant by day or night that these hard-won rights do not protect you and guard you in every move you make, every word you speak, every thought you think. Guard this wealth of freedom with the same spirit of courage that moved Washington and Franklin, Jefferson and Hamilton. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. I know. I, tyranny, democracy's antagonist, her mortal enemy, her very contradiction—I know only too well. That is why—I speak for democracy.

(By Mara Gay Masselink, age 15, Burlington High School, Burlington, Iowa)

Have you ever found a four-leaf clover? Most people say that if you find one it will bring good luck to you. I never had the good fortune to find one in a clover patch, but I do have a different kind of four-leaf clover. It has many different names, but I call it democracy.

Four leaves—they symbolize our four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. You won't find any of these in a country that doesn't have my kind of a four-leaf clover—green with life, like this wonderful land of ours that so many of us take for granted.

The clover stands tall, and, if it were larger, perhaps it would wave in the wind like our flag. When you see the Stars and Stripes being held high, waving in the breeze, with the sun shining on its folds, don't you feel a thrill inside?

It's not the flag, really, but it's all of the wonderful things that it stands for. It stands for millions of acres of rich land—land that belongs to a free people. "Oh, beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountains' majesty above a fruited plain." It's the cattle ranch in Wyoming, the little fishing village in Maine, the metropolis of New York, and the cotton plantation in Georgia. Can you see it now? I can.

Freedom of speech is the first leaf of my clover. It tells us that we don't have to watch every word we say—like the little boy who went to school in the totalitarian country. Every morning he'd say to his mother, "Don't worry, Mommy. I won't say anything today in school that will hurt us." You don't want your children to say that, and I don't want mine to either. They won't, as long as we keep our freedom of speech alive.

The second leaf is our freedom of religion. We don't know what it's like to live in a country where there isn't any religion, where there aren't any churches to attend. Many people do, people that have had that leaf torn from their clover.

Freedom from want? Yes, there are a lot of people who criticize and complain about our way of life. But when you get right down to it, there really isn't anything important that we lack.

And freedom from fear, the fourth and last leaf. It's the fourth leaf that makes the clover different from an ordinary one. Freedom from fear makes a democracy different from a totalitarian country. Are you afraid that you might be awakened in the middle of night tonight by the secret police and taken away from your family and home, never to return? Of course, you aren't. And, as long as you keep that fourth leaf on your clover, you won't have to be in constant fear.

This clover isn't indestructible. It can be killed. There are those who have been trying to kill it ever since democracy began. True, they've never succeeded, but today more than ever before we need to guard that four-leaf clover and keep others from trampling it—because freedom is everything to us.

But more than that we must believe in democracy, for if we don't we shall lose it. Our four-leaf clover will die and its leaves will wither, one by one.

So it's up to us to keep our freedoms, to let our clover of democracy live as a green, growing sign to people everywhere. For if our clover died the place where it had been would be empty and barren, like our lives would be if we lost democracy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to call on these visitors and ask them to stand. They are Dwight Clark, Jr., 18, Fort Collins High School senior, Fort Collins, Colo.; Mara Gay Masselink, 15, Burlington High School junior, Burlington, Iowa; George A. Frilot III, 17, Jesuit High School senior, New Orleans, La.; Thaddeus S. Zolkiewicz, 17, Canisius High School senior, Buffalo, N. Y.

All four of the contestants are on their feet in the gallery, and I think we should give them a big hand.

[The contestants, standing in their places in the gallery, were greeted with applause.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am happy to yield. The Senator from Louisiana shares in the honor, because one of the contestants is from his State.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it was my privilege last year to accord honor to Miss Narita Newbrough, of Baton Rouge, La., who was selected as one of four in the Voice of Democracy contest which has been described by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. It now becomes my distinct privilege to say something about George A. Frilot III, of New Orleans.

As the distinguished Senator from Colorado indicated, George is one of the four coequal winners of the annual contest sponsored by the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. George is a senior at Jesuit High School in New Orleans. He describes himself as a fair student, although his average at high school is 90.8 and he was a straight A pupil throughout grammar school. He is very active at school. He is president of the Philelectic Society, secretary of the Key Club, member of the senior debating team, and member of Catholic organizations at Jesuit High School. He says he has little time for athletics, with the exception of tennis. He is a member of the New Orleans Lawn Tennis Club and, in 1949, won the junior city-wide tennis tournament. He is captain of the junior marine battalion at Jesuit High School and is his class treasurer. He is 17 years old; both his parents are living, and his father is a realtor in New Orleans.

I wish to take this occasion to compliment highly these four fine young people.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am very proud that one of this year's winners in the Voice of Democracy contest is from my own State. His name, as has been indicated by the Senator from Colorado, is Thaddeus S. Zolkiewicz, and he is a Canisius High School senior, Buffalo, N. Y.

I am very glad to join in welcoming Mr. Zolkiewicz and his cowinners in the contest, and I extend to each one of them my heartiest congratulations upon their noteworthy achievement. At the same time, I extend to them best wishes for their future success. I hope this outstanding accomplishment will be only a forerunner of much greater things to come.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] in their expressions of pride in these young folks from their respective States who have won this outstanding honor. Because of a mix-up in my mail, it was only this morning that I received notice of these awards, and I hasten to catch up with loose ends.

I knew of the contest, and I am indeed proud that Miss Masselink, a young woman from Burlington High School, is one of the four winners.

We in Iowa are proud of our young people, as, of course, others are proud of those in their respective States. But this particular honor is, I think, one that is outstanding because of the ability required of the contestants, and I am sure it will contribute to their future advancement.

We are proud to have all four of these winners here, and I, as a Senator from the State of Iowa, am especially proud that the young lady from my State is one of four in the United States who have won by their own efforts this tremendous honor.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for giving me the opportunity to acknowledge what Miss Masselink has done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate the remarks made by the Senator from Iowa.

I wish to tell the Senate a few things about Dwight Clark, Jr., the winner from Colorado. I think it is important that we know something about these young folks.

Dwight was born on January 21, 1934, at Great Bend, Kans. I cannot find any fault with that, because I, too, was born in Kansas. With his parents he moved to Fort Collins, Colo., in the fall of 1944, at the age of 10. I am impressed by the fact that at the age of 10 he convinced his folks that they should move to Colorado because I think that is when Dwight showed his first spark of genuine judgment. I left Kansas and finally reached Colorado, so I commend Dwight very highly for following in my footsteps.

In the ninth grade, Dwight was president of his class and editor of the school newspaper.

When a junior in high school he was elected president of the Colorado Association of High School Student Councils and represented this State at the annual student council national convention held in Wellesley, Mass., in June 1951.

Active in the National Forensic League, Dwight won the degree of distinction. He was the Colorado and Wyoming entry in oratory at the annual tournament of the National Forensic League, which was held at Pepperdine College in Los Angeles in June 1951. At this tournament he was first in the Nation in the radio-announcing division, and was presented with a beautiful trophy which was provided by radio station KMPC in Los Angeles. For bringing this honor to his home town, the Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce awarded him a national recognition certificate.

This year, his senior year, Dwight is student body president of Fort Collins High School. He is on the debate team, is acting in the dramatic club, and for the third consecutive year was voted by his classmates the boy most likely to succeed.

Dwight has been an announcer on radio station KCOL in Fort Collins since he was 14 years old. He does all types of broadcasting, and has a program of his own every weekday, beamed especially to teen-agers, and called A Date With Dwight.

He was chosen champ of the week on Jane Sterling's KOA Denver radio program, These Kids of Ours, which honors outstanding Colorado boys and girls.

He won first place in an essay contest on Americanism, Why I Prefer the American Way, sponsored by the First National Bank of Fort Collins, and was awarded a \$25 United States Savings bond.

Dwight has spoken at least once before most of the many service clubs and organizations in Fort Collins. He has helped plan and announce on the radio station numerous charity drives. He is a member of the Methodist Church and is active in the youth organizations.

Besides all these activities, he always has maintained an A average in his school work.

I am, indeed, very proud to have the honor of making this brief statement today about Dwight Clark, Jr.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the bill (S. 759) to extend to screen-vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, 1952 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the United States reclamation law, 50 years of great progress in reclamation and irrigation in the United States.

I suppose that we in the State of Washington can point to the largest project in the United States initiated by the Bureau of Reclamation, in fact, probably the largest reclamation project in the world, namely, the Columbia Basin project.

This year we shall celebrate not only the fiftieth anniversary of progress in reclamation, but we shall also celebrate the completion of a great project in the State of Washington, which is the first project to pay out, as it were, or pay back to the Government every dime the Government loaned in order to develop it. This is the great irrigation project in the Yakima Valley. Not only has it paid back its loan to the Government, but it has paid it with interest.

During the life of the project, we figure conservatively that there will be paid to the Government in taxes 5 or 6 times the cost of the project.

Congress has been very generous in aiding by its appropriations over many years the development of the Columbia Basin, and this year we shall celebrate the obtaining of the first loan.

In conjunction with 50 years of irrigation and reclamation progress, we are probably going to be visited by a great many officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and others in the Department of the Interior who have had so much to do with the development of the Columbia Basin. On May 22 we shall begin what is planned as a 5-day commemoration or celebration of the opening of the world's greatest irrigation project. The water for this project is furnished by the Columbia River and the Grand Coulee Dam. I wish to read from an excellent article about this project by John W. Ball in this morning's Washington Post. I may say that already much information about the event is beginning to roll from many mimeographs and newspapers and other mediums of expression throughout the area.

The sponsors of the celebration of 50 years of irrigation are going to give away one completely equipped farm on the new land. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are making a survey and conducting some sort of contest throughout the United States, in which the most deserving veteran of foreign wars who

wants to farm will be given this award. Veterans from World War II, and also from the Korean war, will be eligible. The gift is estimated by the Interior Department officials to be worth approximately \$60,000. The land is near Moses Lake, Wash., in the middle of the Columbia Basin project, near where the water will bring in the first land.

This year, in addition to the celebration, we hope, with the cooperation of Congress, to have some 87,000 acres of irrigated land. This land will, in fact, be new-made. Today it is covered with sagebrush, extending as far as the eye can see. Because of the extreme dryness of the area, heretofore there has been little farming in this vast section. However, with water from the coulee and Columbia River, the land will be the most fertile in the world. It is capable of producing in abundance many kinds of crops. The 87,000 acres of land, if provided with dependable water supplies, will grow a wide variety of crops. Every year from now on it is our hope to add 60,000 acres, until 1,000,000 acres will be made crop-bearing, making this the greatest irrigation project in the world.

Twelve of the world's largest pumps will lift the water from 280 to 360 feet, from Roosevelt Lake, the storage reservoir behind Grand Coulee, into the coulee itself. The Grand Coulee is what we call a hanging lake, or an ancient river bed. This water will be the regulating reservoir for this huge project.

According to some material we now have from the Reclamation Bureau, when the first trickle of water reaches the first farm, it will inaugurate not only the greatest project in the known world, but a project for which there is no comparison, even on the planning board. We are now discussing the question of statehood for Alaska. In 20 years we shall have a population in the Columbia Basin sufficiently large to constitute a new State in the Union. It will be a place where those who wish to farm can find new land, where people can start new lives and make an excellent living for themselves, while at the same time adding to the productive wealth of the country. We expect to have more than half a million people in that one area. As I say, Congress has been very cooperative. We are glad to have this project over the hill, as it were. The first 87,000 acres will come in this year, and there will be an additional 60,000 acres a year in the following years, until the total reaches 1,000,000 acres.

Congress has enacted some wise amendments to the reclamation laws, which will prohibit all types of speculation in the new fertile land which will be brought in. We have limited the acreage to not more than 160 acres, because most of the farms will be small farms which can be operated by a family without too much of an investment.

I wished to call this matter to the attention of the Congress at this time, not only because of the project itself but also because 1952 marks 50 years of progress in irrigation and reclamation in the United States. Congress has at all times wisely passed upon the feasibility of irrigation and reclamation projects, particularly in the West, so that

during the 50 years all projects, including the Grand Coulee, were projects which would eventually pay out, projects which were worth while, and projects on which the cost per acre was such that it was feasible to farm the land. I hope that the celebration will point up that fact. I hope that Members of Congress who have an interest in irrigation and reclamation, particularly in the West, will wish to go out there and see this huge project. I am sure that the officials will extend a cordial invitation.

So this year we inaugurate a monument to progress, and to the wisdom and soundness of congressional policy in the development of our great latent and potential resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very excellent article to which I have referred, by John W. Ball, published in the Washington Post of February 18, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERAN TO BE GIVEN EQUIPPED \$60,000 FARM IN CELEBRATION FOR GIANT IRRIGATION PROJECT

(By John W. Ball)

The State of Washington will be the mecca for Bureau of Reclamation officials and higher-ups of the Interior Department late in May.

On May 22 will begin a 5-day celebration of the opening of the world's greatest irrigation project, with water from the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

Already the blurbs about the event are starting to roll from the Department's mimeographs. But even the greatest assortment of Hollywood superlatives can't tell the magnitude of the project.

To add to the attraction the sponsors of the celebration plan to present a fully made, all-equipped, completely irrigated farm, with buildings, machinery, household furniture, and even stocked with livestock, planted and cultivated, to the "most deserving" veteran of World War II or the Korean war that can be discovered.

GIFT WORTH \$60,000

This gift is estimated by Interior officials to be worth around \$60,000. It is near Moses Lake, Wash. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are holding contests in every State to select candidates for the prize. The final choice will be made by judges, including Dr. William T. Spanton, of the Federal Security Agency; Allen B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau; Herschel D. Newsum, master of the National Grange; M. L. Wilson, Director of the Federal-State Extension Service; and Dillard D. Lasseter, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

This year some 87,000 acres of land will be irrigated. The land, in fact, will be virtually "new made." Today it is covered with sagebrush extending as far as the eye can see. Because of the extreme dryness of the area, there has heretofore been little farming. The land, however, is fertile and can grow a wide variety of crops if provided with dependable water supplies.

Every year, beginning next year, an additional 60,000 acres will come under irrigation until a million acres will be made crop-bearing. Some idea of the magnitude of the project is given in the following statistics:

STATISTICS SHOW MAGNITUDE

Twelve of the world's largest pumps will lift the water from 280 to 360 feet from Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake—the storage reservoir—into the Grand Coulee. The

Grand Coulee is a "hanging lake," or ancient river bed, which will be the regulating reservoir for the project.

Each of the 12 pumps would be sufficient to meet the water requirements of New York City. The Grand Coulee Dam power plant, furnishing power for the pumps, is the largest in the world.

According to advance material from the Reclamation Bureau, when the first trickle of water reaches the first farm, one of the greatest public celebrations ever held in the West will be set off.

"This epic-making occasion," it adds, "will be marked with not 1 day but 5 days of spontaneous, well-directed observance, with pageants, ceremonies, carnivals, dancing, etc."

MASS RELIGIOUS RITES

On the Sunday of the 5-day period a spectacular mass church celebration is planned. The Allied Churches of the Northwest promise an "inspiring religious observance, with a nationally known speaker, the world's largest choir, and a mass worship of 50,000 persons. It is to be staged on sagebrush slopes in the heart of the project area."

In the next 20 years, Interior officials predict, 13,000 new farms will spring up on the now barren land, and the population of Washington will be increased by at least 200,000.

"Veritably a new State is being added to the Union," an Interior press agent wrote. "Without the spectacular aspects of the Cherokee Strip land rush, there will be opened in Washington one of the Nation's last frontiers."

NOMINATION OF ANDREW N. OVERBY TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Andrew N. Overby to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, be considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, as in executive session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from California is about to speak on the statehood bills. I am glad that he is. I had hoped that we would have more speeches today on the statehood bills. We have had under consideration for some time Senate bill 50. I hope we may reach a vote upon that bill in the near future. After today, if there are no speeches ready, I want the Senate to be ready to vote. We have not had very many speeches upon the statehood bills. I know that the people of Alaska and Hawaii are anxiously awaiting the decision of the Congress, and I hope that we may make some progress.

It is immaterial to me whether we have a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate or not, if we can reach a vote at a reasonable time. Of course, we agreed that we would not vote today; but after today, if speeches are not ready, I think the Senate should proceed to a vote.

I am happy that the distinguished Senator from California is about to speak on the bill today. I hope that other speeches may follow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, 103 years ago the State of California came under the American flag. Two years later my State was admitted into the Union without going through the apprenticeship of Territorial Government.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate and of the country the fact that the two great political parties, in their national conventions in 1948, made declarations relative to the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. Political parties should be very careful as to what they put in their platforms, and should be equally careful to see to it that they carry out their platforms. I call to the attention of my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle the fact that the Democratic national platform of 1948 had this to say:

We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

I think that was a covenant with the American people and a pledge that, should the Democratic Party come into power in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, it would follow through and immediately grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. It seems to me that it would be a breach of faith on the part of those representing that great political party if they did not support the platform in that regard.

As to the party to which I belong, the Republican Party, that party said in its platform in 1948:

We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

In that connection, I say, if eventually, why not now? I think the case for statehood for both these great Territories can be amply demonstrated. Those platform pledges were made in the year 1948. Four years have now passed. Certainly the platform committees and the national conventions must have given careful consideration to the pledges prior to making them. The pledges having been made, it seems to me that there is an obligation on this side of the aisle, just as there is on the other side of the aisle, to carry out those platform pledges.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy the Senator from California has pointed out the obligations which both of the great political parties have assumed with respect to statehood for these two Territories. It may be pointed out further that one of the reasons why the political parties have repeatedly gone on record as holding out the hope of early statehood, in the case of one party, and eventual statehood in the case of the other

party, was that it has been recognized that these are the only two remaining incorporated Territories of the United States.

In other words, they are Territories to whose people Congress, by causing them to be incorporated into the Union, has held out for years the promise of statehood. No other possessions of the United States fall into that category. Every incorporated Territory up to this time has been granted the statehood which had been promised. In these two instances the promise has not been kept for decades. The time is here to keep the promise.

I am very happy to be able to say that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have indicated their loyal support of the platform pledges. I have no hesitation in saying that the majority of the Senate is ready now to act favorably upon both statehood bills.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, from which committee have come the two statehood bills, that I agree with him. If the Senate could get to the point of voting, and thus make its will felt, there are sufficient votes available to gain statehood for both Territories, I believe, and certainly there can be no doubt in the case of the Territory of Hawaii. I hope that Members of the Senate may, without undue delay, at least have an opportunity to stand up and be counted on this issue.

I believe the question of statehood is very vital to the American people, as well as to the people of the two Territories involved. I do not believe any function of the Senate or the House of Representatives is higher than that of determining the question of whether another area shall be admitted as a State into the great Union of States. Certainly it deserves the close attention of the Senate and of the country as a whole, and I hope that we shall have an opportunity to get a record vote in the not too distant future.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield again to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say that I am rather amused by the fact that the Senator from California is compelled today to make his speech to practically empty seats in the Senate Chamber. I want the occupants of the galleries to understand that the reason the seats are empty today is principally because all the Republican Senators, who were honoring Lincoln last week, have not yet returned, and Democratic Senators, who are about to travel to the four ends of the continental United States to honor Jefferson and Jackson, are getting their bags packed to depart. The curious thing is, however, that Lincoln was not a timid soul; Jefferson was not a timid soul; and Jackson was not a timid soul. Not one of the three great American statesmen whom we all delight to honor was afraid to allow incorporated Territories to enter the Union.

Lincoln in his time supported statehood for Territories of small population.

Jefferson was the author of the Louisiana Purchase, which led the way for the great expansion of the continental United States. Jackson, too, was an expansionist. He was an advocate of statehood for Florida. Since the Senator from California has spoken about the obligations which both of our political parties assumed in their political platforms, I desire to point out that the men we are honoring in our speeches during February showed by their acts that they were supporters of statehood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wyoming.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "What Blocks Alaskan Statehood?" published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT BLOCKS ALASKAN STATEHOOD?

In the debate upon statehood for Alaska—and Hawaii—there have been many weighty comments on the remoteness of these portions of the United States, their relative lack of population or homogeneity, the breach of tradition which thus far has given full State's rights only to contiguous areas of continental America. But of late there has been greater emphasis, even if it has not always been stated explicitly and publicly, on the motives which lead many southern Senators to oppose the admission of these important territories into legal equality with the other States of the Union. It has become clear that a very important element in this opposition is the fear that four new Senators, from regions which do not share the southern point of view, will lead to an end of the South's ability to block cloture on debate. Since this has been the wordy weapon of a virtual southern veto on many questions, the Senators are not disposed to relinquish it.

The question of admitting any territory as a new State is a serious one and deserves consideration on the highest plane. In this tense period of international friction, when the force of American ideals no less than the strength of American arms is being tested, the practical and ideological reasons for elevating Alaska and Hawaii to statehood are of great moment to every American. To have the debate confused, the citizens of the two Territories rebuffed, for purposes of legislative maneuvering, is nothing less than shocking.

This week the Alaska question is expected to come before the Senate on a motion to recommit the bill authorizing statehood. If the motion fails, both Alaska and Hawaii may soon expect to furnish new stars for the flag. If the motion succeeds or the subject is sidetracked by methods which have been successfully used in delaying statehood in the past, the Alaskans, Hawaiians, and other supporters will again be frustrated—and, what is more, the processes of American legislation on a subject of grave importance will have been misused. Cloture is a technical matter of much concern to the Senate; the arguments for and against it as a principle and when applied to any given situation are likely to be complex. But to attempt to maintain a defense against it by permanently keeping thousands of Americans in a status of second-class citizenship is in itself indefensible. Every Senator should search his conscience this week and determine whether he can ethically lend aid and comfort to such a device.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we make a mistake if we think, as some are prone to do, that the United States was finished in 1912 when the forty-seventh and forty-eighth States were admitted to the Union. The United States will not be rounded out until we admit as States the only two incorporated Territories remaining under the flag. We promised them statehood in exactly the same way we promised it to all the other Territories which subsequently were admitted to statehood. Now let us make good on the promise.

Alaska and Hawaii are unique in this day. Their status is completely different from that of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the scattered island areas mentioned sometimes by opponents of statehood as probably to be next in line if we set a precedent by admitting Alaska and Hawaii. In admitting the Northern Territory and the Pacific one we will not be setting a precedent but fulfilling one. For their status is exactly the same as that of all the Western Territories which went on to become States. They are incorporated Territories, and there is all the difference in the world between an incorporated Territory and an unincorporated one so far as the claim to statehood is concerned.

The distinction between an incorporated and an unincorporated Territory was first drawn by the Supreme Court of the United States in the so-called *Insular Cases* (182 U. S. 1; 182 U. S. 244), decided in 1901. The Court was asked to decide whether the requirement of the Constitution that duties, imports, and excises be uniform throughout the United States was applicable to Puerto Rico so as to render invalid a provision of the Foraker Act, Puerto Rico's first organic act, establishing a schedule of customs duties on merchandise from Puerto Rico entering the continental United States. The Court concluded that Puerto Rico was not a part of the United States for the purpose of the constitutional provision. They held further that Puerto Rico had not been incorporated into the United States, and that the Constitution was not in force and effect there. In contradistinction is the status of Alaska and Hawaii, called incorporated Territories because the Congress has expressly provided that in each of these Territories the Constitution shall have the same force and effect as elsewhere in the United States.

The courts have held that the act of incorporation must be specific. As Chief Justice Taft stated in *Balzac v. Puerto Rico* (258 U. S. 306), April 10, 1922:

Incorporation occurs when a Territory is made a part of the United States, as distinguished from merely belonging to the United States.

The Chief Justice went on to say:

Incorporation is not to be assumed without express declaration, or an implication so strong as to exclude any other view.

The first of the incorporated Territories was the Northwest Territory, established by the Northwest Ordinance, which was enacted by the Congress in

1787. The Northwest Territory was erected out of land ceded to the Federal Government by the Original Thirteen States. The ordinance granted the people of the Territory certain basic personal and political rights; it formulated a plan for the immediate government of the Territory; and it outlined the policy of the United States with respect to ultimate status of the Territory. It did the latter by expressly providing that when the population in any of the districts into which the Territory was divided should have reached a certain figure—60,000—the district was to be admitted into the Union as a State on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. President, I may say, regarding the figure of 60,000, that both the Territory of Hawaii, which now has a population of almost 500,000, and the Territory of Alaska, which has a population of approximately 120,000, are considerably larger in population than the districts which were to be admitted into the Union, after having been parts of the Northwest Territory. Hawaii is almost ten times that large, and Alaska is almost twice as large as the general standard which was set at that time.

The Northwest Ordinance was one of a long series of acts which made provision for the Government of the Territories of the United States. It set the pattern for these organic acts, which included, among others, those for the Southwest Territory, the Indian Territory, the Territory of Michigan, the Territory of Illinois, and the Territory of Orleans. Each of these areas was an "incorporated Territory," although all of them were erected before the Supreme Court decision which gave currency to that phrase. Each of these areas was admitted into the Union as a State, or was subdivided into districts which were admitted as States. Their history indicates that the ultimate destiny of an incorporated Territory is statehood. In other words, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, the theory underlying Territorial status was to provide a period of apprenticeship during which the Territories would obtain the qualifications for membership in the sisterhood of States.

Alaska and Hawaii are the only unincorporated Territories remaining under the jurisdiction of the United States. These Territories—and the same could be said of all the former Territories—were not immediately incorporated from the time of annexation. For example, from the time of its annexation in 1898 until the enactment by Congress in 1930 of the organic law for Hawaii, that Territory remained unincorporated. From the date of cession, in 1867, until 1884, Alaska was an unincorporated Territory. It was organized as a Territory under the act of May 17, 1884—Twenty-third United States Statutes, page 24—as amended.

Judicial recognition of Alaska's incorporated status has been given in several cases, including *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516); *Nagle v. United States* (191 Fed. 141); and *United States v. Farwell* (76 F. Supp. 35). In the case of *Steamer Coquiltam v. United States* (163 U. S. 345-352), the political

status of Alaska first came squarely before the Supreme Court of the United States for consideration, and the Court said:

Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States. It was so designated in that order (assigning Alaska to the ninth judicial circuit), and has always been so regarded. And the court established by the act of 1884 is the court of last resort within the limits of that Territory.

Again, in 1903, the same Court, in deciding the case of *Binns v. United States* (194 U. S. 486-490), wherein the constitutionality of the license laws of Alaska was involved, quoted from the *Cogitlam* case, and then affirmed it.

The legal status of Alaska among the noncontiguous possessions of the United States was considered settled by the Supreme Court in 1905. At that time, the possessions which had recently been acquired from Spain—Puerto Rico and the Philippines—were declared to be unincorporated Territories, appurtenant to, and dependencies of, the United States, but not a part of the United States. On the other hand, Alaska was placed by the Court along with Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico, in the class of incorporated Territories. The reasoning was that the treaty with Russia concerning Alaska manifested an intention to admit the inhabitants of the ceded Territory to the enjoyment of citizenship and expressed the purpose to incorporate the Territory into the United States.

The language of the Alaska treaty was, as Representative Wedemeyer, of Michigan, stated in the House of Representatives on April 17, 1912, "practically the clause contained in the treaty by which we acquired Louisiana, Florida, and the Mexican cessions. The words are almost identical in those three treaties, and the Supreme Court has defined and given them force. When this treaty was proclaimed and approved by Congress, we are justified in saying that Alaska was incorporated into the body of the United States and that those people had the promise of future statehood for the Territory."

The issue then before the Congress was the measure which became the Alaska Organic Act—37 United States Statutes, page 513. In the legislative history of that act, we find further references to statehood as Alaska's ultimate goal. On the same day Representative Willis, of Ohio, said:

But may I remind you that if we are to change the form of Territorial government in Alaska, or, to be more accurate, if we are to give Alaska a Territorial legislature, it should not be because she has a tremendous amount of coal, not because of her immense mineral resources, not even because of her agricultural possibilities, nor because of her splendid mountain scenery, nor because of her tremendous resources in the way of timber—not for any of these material facts. These are not the things that make up a State. They are the broad foundations upon which a State may be built, but if we are to give Alaska a Territorial legislature, it must be because it can be shown that there are living in that Territory people who are qualified for self-government to the extent it is proposed to grant it by this bill. I need to

remind you only of a line or two of that old stanza of poetry:

"What constitutes the State?

Not high-raised battlement or labored mound, thick wall or moated gate.

Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned—

Not bays and road-armed ports, where laughing at the storm rich navies ride;

Not starred and spangled courts, where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.

Nay, not these; but men—

Men with powers as far above dull brutes endued in forest brake or den as beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude."

These, then, constitute the State—not the wealth of forest, field, or mine; not the rich valleys, nor the teeming rivers, nor the snow-capped mountain peaks—not these, but rather the people that make up the community—these constitute the State.

Alaska's Delegate to Congress, James Wickersham, who had long been a United States district judge, before coming to Washington to represent the Territory, was even more specific. In the House of Representatives, on April 24, 1912, he said:

Alaska is one of the organized Territories of the United States in the same sense that Arizona and New Mexico were Territories before their admission into the Union as States. A territory is property belonging to the United States. If once incorporated into a body of the Nation, it will, when future development shall make it proper, become a State in the Union, but during the term of its territorial pupillage it is subject to control by such form of government as Congress in its wisdom, or want of it, may establish over it.

It is not necessary to cite other authorities or argument to demonstrate that—

1. Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States.

2. It is an organized Territory.

3. The Constitution of the United States extends over it.

4. It is incorporated into the United States.

5. It occupies the identical plane of relationship to the United States, and to the several States, that Arizona and New Mexico do.

6. The treaty of cession pledged the United States that the inhabitants thereof "shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States," and, therefore,

7. In the natural course of events, when its Territory shall be settled and organized and when its growth and permanent development shall make it desirable, one or more sovereign States will be organized out of the Territory of Alaska and admitted into the Union.

It must inevitably continue to be developed, guided, and controlled by its people, under the Constitution of the United States, until finally it shall become one (or more) of the sovereign States in the American Union. That result cannot finally be avoided, though it may long be delayed by the refusal of Congress to give its active aid and assistance to bring it to fruition.

Sumner and Seward, and that group of statesmen which represented the ideas of their great leader, Abraham Lincoln, clearly foresaw the strategic and material value of the Territory to the United States and intended that Alaska should become a member of the family of the United States upon exact constitutional equality with every other member thereof. The Supreme Court

of the United States has clearly, forcefully, and finally determined that their efforts were effectual.

Many years earlier—in fact, during the debate in the United States Senate on May 28, 1867, on ratification of the treaty of purchase from Russia—Senator Charles Sumner had specifically dedicated Alaska to future statehood in the Union and made a prophetic appeal to the Senate on behalf of the tide of Americans to flow into Alaska in the future. When Secretary Seward visited Sitka in August 1869 he said he realized the need for a "Territorial civil government," and doubted not that Congress would supply it "during the coming winter because our political system rejects alike anarchy and executive absolutism." He said he did not doubt "that the political society to be constituted here, first as a Territory, and ultimately as a State or many States, will prove a worthy constituency of the Republic."

The only President of the United States ever to visit the Alaska mainland during his incumbency, Warren G. Harding, in a speech at Juneau on July 28, 1923, said:

Alaska is destined for ultimate statehood. Our adopted program must be a program of Alaska for Alaskans. There are a few similar areas in the world that present such a natural invitation to make a State of widely varied industries and permanent character.

Thus we see that not alone by virtue of the general proposition that incorporation of a Territory makes it a candidate for ultimate statehood, but by numerous specific promises and declarations, Alaska in seeking the full dignity of statehood is claiming only what is hers by right.

The unique and advanced status conferred on a Territory by incorporation is underlined by the fact that that step, once taken, cannot be revoked. As Mr. Justice Harlan stated in his concurring opinion in *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 529, 530):

Congress cannot suspend the operation of the Constitution in any Territory after it has come under the sovereign authority of the United States, nor, by any affirmative enactment, or by mere nonaction, can Congress prevent the Constitution from being the supreme law for any peoples subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

This principle has been stated by numerous other authorities. For example, in the *Principles of Constitutional Law of the United States*—fourth edition, 1931, page 214—the author, Thomas M. Cooley, says:

It is equally clear that Congress may, if it chooses, extend the privileges of the Constitution to the Territories and, when once granted, the privileges cannot be taken away.

In the *American Constitutional System*, by J. M. Mathews, edition, 1940, pages 340, 343, it is stated:

On the other hand, in the case of Alaska which, as we have seen, is an incorporated Territory, it was held that the provision of the sixth amendment, providing for the trial of crimes by jury, was operative in Alaska by its own force and, consequently, an act of Congress, depriving inhabitants of Alaska of

the right to trial by a common-law jury, was repugnant to the Constitution and void (*Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516, 1905)).

Too much emphasis cannot be put on the fact that, from a constitutional standpoint, incorporation is a step toward statehood—a declaration of intention to make a Territory a State. Under our American system, incorporation has never been anything else. It has never been a step in any other direction. Decisions of the courts have underlined this principle over and over again. Judge Parker, in proceedings in habeas corpus in the district court for Arkansas, in October 1883, in *Ex parte Morgan* (20 Fed. 304, 305), held:

The word "territory," when used to designate a political organization, has a distinctive, fixed, and legal meaning under our political institutions. We find a continental resolution of October 10, 1780, to be the foundation of our territorial system. This declares that the "demesne or territorial lands shall be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States, and be settled and formed into distinct Republican States; which shall become members of the Federal Union and have the same rights of sovereignty, freedom, and independence as other States." (Schouler's History of the United States, 98.)

Chief Justice Taft, in *Balzac v. Puerto Rico* (258 U. S. 311), stated:

We need not dwell on another consideration which requires us not lightly to infer, from acts thus easily explained on other grounds, an intention to incorporate in the Union these distant ocean communities of a different origin and language from those of our continental people. Incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood. Without, in the slightest degree, intimating an opinion as to the wisdom of such a policy, for that is not our province, it is reasonable to assume that when such a step is taken it will be begun and taken by Congress deliberately and with a clear declaration of purpose, and not left a matter of mere inference or construction.

Earlier, Mr. Justice Harlan, in *McAllister v. United States* (141 U. S. 188) decided May 25, 1891, had held that—

The organization of governments for the Territories was and is temporary, and would be superseded when the Territories became States of the Union.

Mr. Justice Sutherland, in *O'Donoghue v. United States* (260 U. S. 532), decided May 29, 1933, held:

Since the Constitution provided for the admission by Congress of new States (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 1), it properly may be said that the outlying continental public domain, of which the United States was the proprietor, was, from the beginning, destined for admission as a State or States into the Union; and that as a preliminary step toward that foreordained end—to tide over the period of ineligibility—Congress, from time to time, created Territorial governments, the existence of which was necessarily limited to the period of pupillage.

In *Ex Parte Morgan* (20 Fed. 305), Judge Parker had held:

Then we find the general laws of Congress relating to Territories: a Territory, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, is an inchoate—begun, but not completed—state—a portion of the country not included within the limits of any State, and not yet admitted as a State into the Union, but organized under the laws of Congress,

with a separate legislature, under a Territorial Governor and other officers appointed by the President and Senate of the United States.

The courts have also referred to organized incorporated Territories as States "in childhood"; as States in "adolescent youth"; as States "in pupillage"; as "embryonic" States; as States in "leading strings"; and as States in their "minority." Thus, Judge Deady, of the Circuit Court for the District of Oregon, in *Nelson v. United States* (30 Fed. 115), decided March 11, 1887, held:

The Territorial State is one of pupillage at best, and may include the mere child as well as the adolescent youth.

Thomas M. Cooley, in *The Principles of Constitutional Law of the United States*, fourth edition, 1931, page 164, says:

Meantime until made a State they (incorporated Territories) are in a condition of temporary pupillage and dependence; and while Congress will be expected to recognize the principle of self-government to such extent as may seem wise, its discretion alone can constitute the measure by which the participation of the people can be determined.

Again we find that in the argument for appellants in *Alaska v. Troy* (288 U. S. 104), on February 27, 1922, John Rustgard, Attorney General of Alaska, contended:

Clause 2 of section 3, article IV, was not intended in any manner to deny to the people of a Territory the rights of American citizens, but was intended to give Congress power to deal with the internal affairs of the embryo States until they were able to assume the duties of their own sovereignty.

In *Nelson v. United States* (30 Fed. 116), Judge Deady had held:

During its minority the Territory, in this (Congress prohibiting manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in a Territory) as well as in other respects, is very properly in congressional leading strings.

Alaska, as an incorporated Territory, has a claim to statehood. While the organic act itself does not contain any express commitment to admit Alaska to the Union upon fulfillment of stated conditions, nevertheless it is implicit in the provisions of the act that the Territory shall be dealt with as other incorporated Territories have been. There is nothing in Alaska's situation to warrant any different treatment. The organic act is closely patterned on the Northwest Ordinance. Admission of Alaska, and Hawaii, too, would complete the pattern established on the mainland. Alaska and Hawaii are our only remaining incorporated Territories. To none of the other remaining territorial areas has the Constitution been extended. There is no historical precedent for the admission of an "unincorporated Territory." Consequently, neither Puerto Rico nor the Virgin Islands can advance any such claim to statehood as can Alaska and Hawaii.

From the standpoint of constitutional law, the Territory of Alaska is an organized, incorporated, political subdivision of the United States, destined to become a State on an equal footing with the original States and those subse-

quently admitted. From every other standpoint, Alaska has fulfilled all the requirements for admission. History calls. The time is now. Let us not fail to heed the call or take advantage of the time.

For a century now California has been the closest neighbor to Hawaii, and so has some claim to knowing her best. It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I plead her case, without any reservation whatsoever.

Hawaii has been an organized Territory for a longer period than had any of the organized Territories which were ultimately admitted to statehood, with the exception of New Mexico. With the lone exception of Oklahoma, it has more population than any of the others had at the time of their admission to the Union.

Today it has a greater population than six of our States and is within close proximity to the total number of people residing in four more. In the fiscal year 1950 Hawaii contributed in Federal taxes more than did nine of our States.

Prior to becoming a Territory Hawaii had been an independent nation—a constitutional republic in 1894 and a constitutional monarchy prior to that time.

The theory of organizing a Territory is to prepare the area for statehood. If we look back at the legislative history we will find that in the debate on the organic Territorial Act amendments were offered providing that the enactment of that legislation should not be construed as promising statehood to Hawaii either at that time or any time in the future. Those amendments were defeated in both the Senate and House of Representatives. It can, of course, be argued that statehood was not necessarily promised, but I wish to point out that both the House and the Senate took positive steps in rejecting these amendments, which in effect indicated that there would be no bar to the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union.

By official vote of the people, she has requested admission into the Union and has approved a State constitution which was duly submitted and approved by the people of Hawaii. Certainly, no individual poll of a few hundred people, some of whom remain anonymous, can outweigh the recorded vote of the people.

I am firmly convinced that Communist activity is no greater a problem there than it is in many other areas of our country. Certainly, Mr. President, no one would suggest that a Territory should be deprived of statehood because it has some Communist termites. Because Hawaii happens to have some of these termites is no valid argument for delaying her admission as a State. To the contrary, statehood will better fortify her people in dealing with a problem which is not just Nation-wide but is world-wide in character.

The record of loyalty in peace and war by the people of the Territory of Hawaii cannot be challenged.

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms have pledged their support to statehood on several occasions.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, four tables. The first table shows that of the 29 States which were admitted into statehood, only the State of New Mexico occupied a Territorial status for a longer period of time than has Hawaii.

The second table sets forth the official Department of Commerce figures showing the present population of Hawaii in comparison with that of the other States of the Union. I wish to invite attention to the fact that today Hawaii has a larger population than the States of Nevada and Wyoming combined, and exceeds the population of both Delaware and Vermont.

I ask that the tables to which I have referred be included as part of my remarks, in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

Territory	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years waited	Population at date of organic act	Population at date of admittance to Union
New Mexico	1850	1912	62	61,547	327,000
Hawaii	1900		51	154,001	499,794
Arizona	1863	1912	49	9,658	204,354
Utah	1850	1896	46	11,383	276,749
Washington	1853	1889	36	11,198	357,232
Michigan	1805	1837	32	4,762	212,267
North Dakota	1861	1889	28		100,983
South Dakota	1861	1889	28	2,977	384,600
Idaho	1863	1890	27		88,548
Montana	1864	1889	25	20,595	142,924
Florida	1822	1845	23		87,445
Wyoming	1868	1890	22	9,118	62,555
Mississippi	1798	1817	19	8,850	75,448
Arkansas	1819	1836	17	14,255	97,574
Oklahoma	1890	1907	17	61,864	1,657,155
Indiana	1800	1816	16	5,641	147,178
Missouri	1805	1821	16	20,845	66,586
Ohio	1787	1803	16		45,365
Colorado	1861	1876	15	34,277	194,327
Nebraska	1854	1867	13	28,841	122,993
Wisconsin	1836	1848	12	30,945	305,391
Oregon	1848	1859	11	13,294	52,465
Illinois	1809	1818	9	12,282	55,211
Minnesota	1849	1858	9	6,077	172,023
Iowa	1838	1846	8	43,112	192,214
Louisiana	1804	1812	8	76,556	76,556
Kansas	1854	1861	7		107,206
Tennessee	1790	1796	6	35,691	105,602
Nevada	1861	1864	3	6,857	6,857
Alabama	1817	1819	2		127,901

TABLE II.—Population by States, 1950

Nevada	160,833
Wyoming	290,529
Delaware	318,085
Vermont	377,747
Hawaii	499,794
New Hampshire	533,242
Idaho	588,637
Montana	591,024
North Dakota	619,636
South Dakota	652,740
New Mexico	681,187
Utah	688,862
Arizona	749,587
Rhode Island	791,896
Maine	913,774
Colorado	1,325,089
Nebraska	1,325,510
Oregon	1,521,341
Kansas	1,905,299
Arkansas	1,909,511
West Virginia	2,005,552
Connecticut	2,007,280
South Carolina	2,117,027
Mississippi	2,178,914
Oklahoma	2,233,351

TABLE II.—Population by States, 1950—Con.

Maryland	2,343,001
Washington	2,378,963
Iowa	2,621,073
Louisiana	2,633,516
Florida	2,771,305
Kentucky	2,944,806
Minnesota	2,982,483
Alabama	3,061,743
Tennessee	3,291,718
Virginia	3,318,680
Wisconsin	3,434,575
Georgia	3,444,578
Indiana	3,934,224
Missouri	3,954,653
North Carolina	4,061,929
Massachusetts	4,690,514
New Jersey	4,835,329
Michigan	6,371,766
Texas	7,711,194
Ohio	7,946,627
Illinois	8,712,176
Pennsylvania	10,498,012
California	10,586,223
New York	14,830,192

Mr. KNOWLAND. The third table, Mr. President, shows the income taxes collected by the States for the fiscal year 1950. The collections from Hawaii exceeded the collections of nine of the States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the third table to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—Comparison of Hawaii with 48 States in collection of internal revenue, 1950

Nevada	\$47,505,504.66
Vermont	48,675,291.39
Wyoming	48,984,119.78
North Dakota	57,680,073.67
South Dakota	64,281,915.85
New Mexico	80,607,390.45
New Hampshire	87,177,119.46
Idaho	91,354,432.82
Montana	91,691,015.68
Hawaii	98,022,630.02
Arizona	106,437,924.41
Utah	109,532,371.32
Mississippi	113,976,845.48
Maine	127,370,116.27
Arkansas	130,984,457.38
South Carolina	191,326,842.58
Rhode Island	239,708,304.56
West Virginia	245,969,387.30
Alabama	298,452,466.06
Nebraska	334,020,815.10
Colorado	353,849,385.05
Oregon	361,510,696.84
Kansas	385,361,679.65
Tennessee	398,608,019.00
Louisiana	410,122,482.26
Iowa	438,239,695.52
Florida	467,624,260.52
Oklahoma	494,893,021.44
Georgia	497,447,795.73
Washington	563,871,537.08
Delaware	566,957,101.64
Minnesota	786,759,261.97
Connecticut	818,038,816.79
Virginia	863,146,269.47
Wisconsin	963,172,326.93
Kentucky	1,056,514,846.71
Indiana	1,202,616,546.51
North Carolina	1,257,159,936.49
Missouri	1,392,271,994.08
Maryland	1,413,473,687.65
New Jersey	1,460,314,212.78
Massachusetts	1,486,571,308.07
Texas	1,683,259,143.16
Ohio	3,292,928,469.25
California	3,558,227,339.92
Pennsylvania	3,886,470,430.26
Michigan	4,156,021,742.15
Illinois	4,329,996,624.80
New York	9,243,924,053.65

Mr. KNOWLAND. From the time we were in school learning our history, Mr. President, we have known that one of the great slogans of liberty has been "No taxation without representation." Today a great organized Territory in the Pacific is paying more taxes to the Federal Government than are nine of the States which have representation in the Senate of the United States. It seems to me that on this basis alone, if there were not the weight of all the other arguments—her population, her long apprenticeship—there would be sufficient reason to grant statehood to Hawaii.

The fourth table is contained in a Gallup poll dated February 2, 1952, which indicates that 69 percent of the American people support the admission of Hawaii as a State in the Union.

Mr. President, by what standards shall we provide for the admission of new States into the Union? Hawaii has fulfilled the requirements of serving a reasonable apprenticeship as a Territory. If we consider it from a population or income standard, certainly Hawaii qualifies favorably with many of the States presently in the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Gallup poll dated February 2, 1952, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, ALASKA IS FAVORED BY WIDE MAJORITY
(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., February 1.—The gap which often exists between public sentiment and congressional action is well illustrated by the fight over statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

At repeated intervals during the past 11 years, Institute surveys have found overwhelming sentiment for admitting Hawaii into the Union. The most recent test, just completed, finds a 6-to-1 vote of approval.

The story on statehood for Alaska is similar—the latest test shows a 9-to-1 ratio in favor.

Here is the trend of sentiment on the two issues:

Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as a State in the Union?
The result:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1941	48	23	29
1946	60	19	21
1950	71	12	17
Today	69	11	20

"Would you favor or oppose having Alaska admitted as a State in the Union?"

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1949	68	7	25
1950	81	8	11
Today	76	8	16

In his state of the Union message last month President Truman recommended statehood for the two Territories, as he had in many previous messages to Congress.

The platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in 1948 pledged statehood for the two Territories.

The House of Representatives in 1950 approved statehood, but the measure died in the Senate.

If Hawaii, which is normally Republican, were to be admitted during the present session of Congress, its two Senators would increase the number of Republican Senators from 46 to 48. This would make the composition of the Senate 50 Democrats to 48 Republicans.

However, if Alaska, normally Democratic, were also admitted during the present session, the Democrats would have a total of 52 seats.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, shall Hawaii be disbarred because it is not contiguous to the continental limits of the United States? That could not be the answer because when my State of California was admitted to the Union it was separated from other States by Territorial lands.

Mr. President, I might say, in regard to some of the Lincoln Day meetings which have recently been held, that I took it upon myself to look up the time it used to take to travel to California in the period of 1848 and 1849, and in later periods. I found that the best time made by the covered wagons in traveling across the plains from Independence, Mo., which is considerably west of the Atlantic seaboard, to California, was approximately 100 days.

In 1860 a speed record was made in getting news to California. The new means of transportation was the Pony Express. At that time the terminus of the telegraph lines was at St. Joseph, Mo. When the news of Lincoln's election was started to be transmitted to the West, it was received in St. Joseph, given to the Pony Express riders, and in the remarkable time of 7 days and 17 hours the news of Lincoln's election was brought to San Francisco.

I can get on a plane in Washington today and have breakfast in San Francisco or Los Angeles tomorrow. So certainly the point that Hawaii is too remote or too distant does not hold water.

One can get on a plane at San Francisco in the evening and be in Hawaii the next morning. So that from the point of view of its proximity to continental United States, actually the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska are far closer to the Nation's Capital than my own State of California was when it was admitted to the Union in 1850. If statehood is to be determined on patriotism and allegiance to American ideals, I can only point to the outstanding record which the peoples of the Hawaiian Islands made during the course of World War II and the present conflict in Korea. They have not only participated equally in this Nation's fight to preserve freedom, but have been willing to do a little more than their share.

Regardless of what yardstick is used, Hawaii, it seems to me, is fully qualified in every respect to become a State.

However, there is another reason which should not be overlooked by the Congress or the American people in considering statehood for Hawaii.

The free way of life is under pressure from the Elbe to the China Sea. Eight-hundred million people are behind the

Communist iron curtain as we meet here today. In the Far East the status of several hundred million more hangs in the balance. International communism is on the march, and this may be the year of decision that will determine whether or not it will move on to new destruction or will recede in the face of the determination by a free world of freemen to maintain their way of life.

The people of Hawaii have much to offer in helping to interpret the spirit of America to the Far East, where there is more than half of the world's population. They can do equally as much in helping the United States understand the complex problems of that vast area of the world. Never before was it more important to the peace of the world and the very security of this Nation that such mutual understanding be achieved.

We dare not remain static while communism becomes a dynamic force in the world. To the contrary, from the Arctic to the mid-Pacific we should resolutely and effectively proclaim to the world that the American citizens in our two organized Territories are no longer to be stateless persons.

Now is the time for us to point out clearly that the people in this great Pacific territory, which is vital to the defense of the Pacific flank of the continental United States, are not merely wards in a distant orphanage, but are an integral part of the American family of States. We would no more tolerate an incursion against either Hawaii or Alaska than we would against any other part of our Union.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is a year of decision for us, also. Let us not fiddle and faddle on the issue of statehood. If we fumble the ball now and let the play be taken away from us by those who detest the free way of life, future generations may wonder what happened to the youth and vigor that made America great.

This year may well become one of the great turning points of history. We must not be complacent and self-satisfied, for therein will be found the seeds of decay.

In life there is no such thing as a status quo. Individuals and governments either grow or they go into a decline and others rise to take their places. As a Nation, our country is still young. New horizons are still ahead of us.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 19, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Sidney A. Belovsky, of New York.
Samuel D. Berger, of the District of Columbia.

John H. Bruins, of New York.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.
Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.

Franklin C. Gowen, of Pennsylvania.
Carlos C. Hall, of Arizona.
Outerbridge Horsey, of New York.
John D. Jernegan, of California.
Robert P. Joyce, of California.
Kenneth C. Krentz, of Iowa.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.

Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Robert Mills McClintock, of California.
Jack K. McFall, of the District of Columbia.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
R. Borden Reams, of Pennsylvania.
G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
William T. Turner, of Georgia.
Ivan B. White, of Oregon.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Patten D. Allen, of New York.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Myron L. Black, of Pennsylvania.
James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Thomas S. Campen, of North Carolina.
Joseph B. Costanzo, of New York.
Robert T. Cowan, of Texas.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Andrew E. Donovan 2d, of California.
James Espy, of Ohio.
Willard Galbraith, of California.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Nat B. King, of Texas.
Ridgway B. Knight, of New York.
Eric Kocher, of New York.
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, of Rhode Island.
William L. Krieg, of Ohio.
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.
Andrew G. Lynch, of New York.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas.
Charles P. O'Donnell, of Illinois.
Elim C. Shaughnessy, of New York.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of Massachusetts.
Edward E. Rice, of Wisconsin.
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
T. Elliot Weil, of New York.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

W. Wendell Blancké, of Pennsylvania.
Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon.
V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William L. Blue, of Tennessee.
Robert M. Brandin, of New York.
Herbert B. Brewster, of Minnesota.
William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia.
William F. Busser, of Pennsylvania.
Don V. Catlett, of Missouri.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
William E. Cole, Jr., of New York.
Thomas J. Cory, of California.
Raymond F. Courtney, of Delaware.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
John Dorman, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur B. Emmons 3d, of Massachusetts.
Thomas S. Estes, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Dennis A. Flinn, of Illinois.
Albert B. Franklin, of Massachusetts.
A. David Fritzlan, of Kentucky.
Paul F. Geren, of Arkansas.
G. McMurtrie Godley, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Paul L. Guest, of California.
Franklin Hawley, of Michigan.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.

John Evarts Horner, of Colorado.
Robert Janz, of Oklahoma.
Harry W. Johnstone, of the District of Columbia.

Easton T. Kelsey, of Michigan.
William Kling, of New York.
William Koren, Jr., of New Jersey.
Eldred D. Kuppinger, of Ohio.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.

Edward T. Lampson, of Connecticut.
William Leonhart, of West Virginia.
Aubrey E. Lippincott, of Arizona.
Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.

Robert H. McBride, of Michigan.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.

Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
William J. Porter, of Massachusetts.
Archibald R. Randolph, of Virginia.

George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
Milton C. Rewinkel, of Minnesota.
Harold H. Rhodes, of Washington.

Maurice S. Rice, of Kansas.
W. Garland Richardson, of Virginia.
Robert W. Rinden, of Iowa.

Leslie L. Rood, of New Jersey.
Claude G. Ross, of California.
Terry B. Sanders, Jr., of Texas.

Alexander Schnee, of New York.
Elvin Selbert, of New York.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.

Frank G. Siscoe, of New Jersey.
Byron B. Snyder, of California.
Joseph S. Sparks, of California.

Wallace W. Stuart, of Tennessee.
Oray Taft, Jr., of California.
John E. Utter, of New York.

Andrew B. Wardlaw, of South Carolina.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
William A. Wieland, of New York.

Charles D. Withers, of South Carolina.
The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

William R. Duggan, of Colorado.
John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania.
John C. Fuess, of Massachusetts.

Charles Gilbert, of New York.
Edward W. Mulcahy, of Massachusetts.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.

Leslie Albion Squires, of California.
The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Oscar V. Armstrong, of North Carolina.
Quentin R. Bates, of Iowa.

George F. Bogardus, of Iowa.
John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
William T. Briggs, of Virginia.

Edward West Burgess, of Wisconsin.
Gardner C. Carpenter, of California.
Stanley S. Carpenter, of Massachusetts.

Stanley M. Cleveland, of New York.
Ralph S. Collins, of Tennessee.
William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

John B. Crume, of Kentucky.
Richard T. Davies, of New York.
Alfred P. Dennis, of Virginia.

Miss Eileen R. Donovan, of Massachusetts.
Thomas A. Donovan, of North Dakota.
Leon G. Dorros, of New York.

Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
Paul F. DuVivier, of New York.
Thomas R. Favell, of Wisconsin.

E. Allen Fidel, of Wyoming.
Seymour M. Finger, of New York.
Richard B. Finn, of New York.

John I. Fishburne, of South Carolina.
William Dale Fisher, of California.
David L. Gamon, of California.

Norman B. Hannah, of Illinois.
Charles E. Higdon, of Tennessee.
John D. Iams, of Oklahoma.

Miss Dorothy M. Jester, of California.
Thomas M. Judd, of Maryland.
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.

Stephen A. Koczak, of New Jersey.
George T. Lister, of New York.

Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
Donald S. Macdonald, of Massachusetts.
John A. McKesson 3d, of New York.

Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.
Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Maryland.
Miss Betty Ann Middleton, of California.

John Y. Millar, of New York.
Daniel W. Montenegro, of New York.
David D. Newsom, of California.

Miss Helen R. Nicholl, of New York.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
Miss Mary S. Olmsted, of New York.

David L. Osborn, of Arkansas.
Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.
Arthur L. Paddock, Jr., of New Jersey.

Leon B. Poullada, of California.
James W. Pratt, of California.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.

Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert J. Redington, of Connecticut.
Edwin C. Rendall, of Illinois.

John Frick Root, of Pennsylvania.
Neil M. Ruge, of California.
Peter Rutter, of Massachusetts.

Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
Joseph A. Silberstein, of New York.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.

Ernest L. Stanger, of Utah.
John L. Stegmaler, of Massachusetts.
Richard H. Stephens, of Utah.

Robert A. Stevenson, of Florida.
James S. Sutterlin, of Kentucky.
Nicholas G. Thacher, of New York.

Malcolm Toon, of Massachusetts.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.

Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado.
Raymond A. Valliere, of New Hampshire.
Wayland B. Waters, of Michigan.

George M. Widney, of Alabama.
Louis A. Wiesner, of Michigan.
Robert M. Winfree, of the District of Columbia.

Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York.
The following-named foreign service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Charles C. Adams, of New York.
Norman Armour, Jr., of New Jersey.
John H. Barber, of California.

Miss Dorothy M. Barker, of Louisiana.
Robert J. Barnard, of Wisconsin.
Raymond J. Barrett, of New York.

Carl E. Bartch, of Ohio.
Raymond J. Becker, of California.
Frederic H. Behr, of New Jersey.

James R. Billman, of California.
Vincent S. R. Brandt, of Rhode Island.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.

Peter R. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Thomas F. Conlon, of Illinois.
John A. Conway, of New York.

Carleton S. Coon, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Jonathan Dean, of New York.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.

Morris Dembo, of New York.
Walter H. Drew, of Colorado.
Adolph Dubs, of Illinois.

Robert W. Eastham, of Virginia.
Warrick E. Elrod, Jr., of Illinois.
Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.

Jack B. Gabbert, of Missouri.
John I. Getz, of Illinois.
Seymour H. Glazer, of Louisiana.

Culver Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Gough, of Colorado.
James C. Haahr, of Minnesota.

Pierson M. Hall, of Kansas.
Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.
William N. Harben, of New York.

Russell C. Heater, of California.
Thomas F. Hoctor, of New York.
Miss Priscilla Holcombe, of the District of Columbia.

Jerome K. Holloway, Jr., of Maryland.
Walter E. Jenkins, Jr., of Massachusetts.
William M. Johnson, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Bayard King, of Rhode Island.

Steven Kline, of California.
Francis X. Lambert, of Massachusetts.
Herbert B. Leggett, of Ohio.

Earl H. Luboensky, of Missouri.
Dayton S. Mak, of Iowa.
Doyle V. Martin, of Oklahoma.

Parke D. Massey, Jr., of New York.
Robert A. McKinnon, of Michigan.
Daniel J. Meloy, of Maryland.

Sam Moskowitz, of Missouri.
Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
Daniel O. Newberry, of Georgia.

John F. O'Donnell, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Oувerson, of Minnesota.
Charles E. Paine, of California.

Howard W. Potter, Jr., of New York.
Lawrence P. Ralston, of Connecticut.
Marion J. Rice, of South Carolina.

William F. Ryan, of Michigan.
Miss Louise Schaffner, of New York.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.

Matthew D. Smith, Jr., of South Dakota.
Ralph S. Smith, of New York.
Moncrieff J. Spear, of New York.

Thomas C. Stave, of Washington.
Lee T. Stull, of Pennsylvania.
Godfrey Harvey Summ, of New York.

George E. Tener 2d, of Pennsylvania.
Adelphos H. TePaske, of Iowa.
Sidney Weintraub, of New York.

Park F. Woliam, of California.
Wendell W. Woodbury, of Iowa.
Charles G. Wootton, of Connecticut.

Mrs. Martha H. Mautner (nee Halleran), of Pennsylvania.

MUTUAL SECURITY

W. John Kenney, of California, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security, vice Richard M. Bissell, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Norman B. Atkins	Allan B. Carter
Edward L. Burwell	Harry Y. Spence
Mitchell R. Zavon	John P. Fort, Jr.
Mario Stefanini	Charles L. Hoffman
John T. Gentry	John L. Grow
Harvey A. Itano	George L. Gee, Jr.
Alexis I. Shelokov	Lance S. Wright
Seymour M. Perry	Robert K. Williams
Calvin R. MacKay	Alfred S. Ketcham
David M. Fried	George W. West
Robert W. Summers	Nicholas C. Leone
David S. Howell	Walter P. Scott
William J. Browne	

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Laurens P. White	Hugh A. Storrow
Alan S. Rabson	Clarence T. McGraw
Walter T. Snow	Carson R. Jones
Marlin D. Greenhalgh	Donald L. Toker

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Lewis V. Lortz, Jr.
Russell S. Wright

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of January 10), 1952.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND REDEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

DIRECTOR OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Ellis G. Arnall, of Georgia, to be Director of Price Stabilization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou hast created us in Thine own image and with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit.

We pray that in this Brotherhood Week we may have a clearer vision of high and helpful things that we may do together for the welfare of all mankind.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to joyous and victorious fulfillment all the nobler aspirations which Thou hast planted within the soul of man.

Grant that we may never harbor within our minds and hearts any attitudes toward our fellow men which are alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Help us to practice the Golden Rule and inspire us with those finer thoughts and feelings which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a more glorious social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONGRESS TO WRESTLE WITH THE BUDGET

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the first real opponent which the President tossed into the ring for Congress to wrestle with was the budget which he sent up to the Hill in the form of his annual budget message. In it he asked Congress to appropriate and spend some \$85,000,000,000 during the next fiscal year which starts July 1, 1952. Anticipated tax revenues for the same period will be about \$71,000,000,000, which would leave a deficit of \$14,000,000,000. Adding that and the current year's deficit to the present national debt would bring it above the statutory limitation of \$275,000,000,000, heretofore set by Congress.

During the first month of this session Congress has not yet actually tackled its opponent. So far it has only been fencing—sort of feeling the monster out before deciding how to approach him and apply effective holds.

ONLY THREE COURSES OPEN

Actually only three holds are open to Congress. It can reduce the size of the budget by cutting expenditures; it can increase the revenues by raising taxes; or it can dodge the issue by following a course of deficit financing. The latter seems to have been the easiest way out in past years, and has resulted in Congress losing earlier bouts with the budget. As a matter of fact it has lost so many bouts in the last 2 decades that many people wonder if their representative in the ring can put up even a semblance of a good contest this year. Up to this point they have witnessed only the feeling-out process.

It is doubtful that Congress will follow the tactic of increasing tax revenues. Many Members spent some time in their districts after adjournment and most, if not all of them are perfectly aware of the attitude of the taxpayer. This being an election year congressional ears, though somewhat cauliflowerered, are beamed toward constituents' views. In addition to that fact they are not sure our economy can stand another tax increase without damaging the productivity of the proverbial golden goose. Congress is not likely to heed the President's requests because they know he is in the opposing corner. Besides, he has not sent up any special message to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON].

CUTTING EXPENDITURES ONLY REALISTIC COURSE

The only way Congress can win the bout with the budget is to whittle it down in size by reducing the amount of Federal expenditures. This it often promises to do but rarely does. What it will do this year remains to be seen. Opportunities for reductions certainly exist. Testimony before committees reveals that the budget is vulnerable, particularly in the military departments. It has too much "fat" in these areas according to some members of the Armed Services Committee of the House. Representative JACK ANDERSON, Republican, California, has introduced a bill which could eliminate a lot of the "fat" by providing for a uniform procurement catalog for all the armed services. Savings up to \$5,000,000,000 annually could be made according to some opinions. Under the present system of procurement the different branches of the armed services pay widely different prices for the same article. In the case of blankets, for instance, the spread in prices has been as much as several dollars each. Other means of cutting military expenditures are presently being pointed out to the Armed Services Committee.

A big question in the public mind in the meantime is, Will Congress really come to grips with the budget problem and whip it, or will it let the bout go by default and resort once more to deficit financing? The national debt as of February 6, 1952, was \$259,000,000,000 and still growing.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday marked the thirty-fourth anniversary of national independence in Lithuania.

Before 1918 that small nation had written a courageous record of a 900 years' fight for its own liberty. For a short period the people of Lithuania enjoyed their richly deserved freedom.

Then, on June 15, 1940, they became the first victims of Communist aggression and treachery. In August 1940 the country was forcibly taken into the U. S. S. R. as the fourteenth Soviet Republic. On June 23, 1941, the day after Germany attacked Russia, the Lithuanians declared their independence and attempted to restore their freedom. All their hopes were crushed, however, when the Germans invaded Lithuania, created the Ostland, and instituted wide-scale repression.

When the Russian offensive drove into Lithuania in the summer of 1944, this brave country was reestablished immediately as a component republic of the Soviet Union, with all the consequent repression and subjugation so well known to all of us. While actual conditions cannot be completely known, there is clear evidence of the curtailing, if not the complete loss, of individual, political, economic, religious, and cultural freedom.

It is estimated that over 500,000 of the Lithuanian people have perished because of political executions, planned starvation, torture, and exile to death camps. Collectivization has leveled her standards to those of Soviet Russia and has made Lithuanian farmers the slaves of the state.

Surely this history should cause each of us to consider most seriously whether we have done our full part in trying to assist the friends of Lithuania in this country in their continued effort to reestablish once again and permanently its independence. It is in the best interests of all of us who know and cherish freedom to do everything within our power to make certain as soon as possible that future anniversaries will be occasions of rejoicing.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DR. EARL JAMES McGRATH

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Dr. McGrath, Commissioner of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call to your attention something which happened recently that created considerable newspaper comment, and which I think should be clarified. On January 16, a Dr. Harold Goldthorpe, of the Department of Education, wrote a letter to a Mr. Frank W. Hamilton, school superintendent in Indianapolis, Ind., in which he called Mr. Hamilton to account for certain statements that he had made in criticizing some phases of the British Government. When this matter was brought to the attention of Dr. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, he was quite disturbed over it. He did not wait for anyone to call him, but he immediately called on me as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, expressed his disapproval of the act mentioned and even suggested that if I thought it proper or necessary he would gladly go before the Committee on Education and Labor and make it clear that he did not condone such letters or statements, and that they were totally out of line with his views and with the policy of the Department. I am including copies of his statements with my remarks. I think it should be said that Dr. McGrath certainly handled this matter in a very fine manner. I want to say another thing, and that is I have found Dr. McGrath to be a very cooperative administrator. He cooperates with the Committee on Education. I have never found him out of line. His chief concern is how he can best conform to the wishes and intent of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the first attack on Commissioner McGrath was entirely unjustified.

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely, and it shows that Members should be careful in making rash charges, and that they should ascertain the facts before they make any charges.

Mr. BARDEN. Not only Members but sometimes to the press. I will include the statements in my remarks, and I thank the gentleman for his comment.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1952.
Mr. FRANK W. HAMILTON,
School No. 76, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Our attention has been recently called to the story in the Indianapolis Star of December 16 which purports to be an interview concerning your experiences in Britain last year as an exchange teacher. There are a number of serious inaccuracies in this statement for which I sincerely hope you have no responsibility. Moreover, there appears to be a question about your tact and judgment in the public use of an exhibit of rationed British food-stuffs, and your efforts as a crusader.

I desire to remind you that on October 15, 1950, you wrote Mr. Nelson, formerly of this staff, as follows: "I realize more every day what tremendous possibilities the exchange program offers for creating better understanding between countries." Reports

similar to this one in the Indianapolis Star (and presumably also your speeches) will cause undesirable public reactions which will deprive excellent teachers in your area of participating in the fine educational opportunities which you recently experienced. Moreover, this kind of publicity will also deprive the Indianapolis schools and those of nearby communities of well-qualified foreign teachers who come to the United States on our exchange programs.

I shall welcome your explanation concerning this newspaper story and suggest that a more responsible and mature effort on your part should be devoted toward building better international relations. May I hear from you at an early date?

Yours very truly,

J. HAROLD GOLDTHORPE,
International Educational Programs.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT BY EARL JAMES MCGRATH, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 4, 1952

I have read the attached letter of January 16, 1952, sent by Dr. J. Harold Goldthorpe, specialist in the exchange of professors, teachers, and students, to Mr. Frank Hamilton, of Indianapolis, Ind. In sending this letter to Mr. Hamilton, Dr. Goldthorpe was acting on his own initiative and responsibility. The Federal Security Administrator and the Commissioner of Education had no knowledge of Dr. Goldthorpe's activities in connection with this case.

I do not share the views expressed in Dr. Goldthorpe's letter. As an American citizen Mr. Hamilton has, of course, the inalienable right to express his opinion on any subject that interests him, including the British Government and the teacher exchange program—to express his opinion whether right or wrong. It is the established policy of the Office of Education not to interfere in any respect with the views, practices, or policies of educators or other citizens in the several States.

As Commissioner of Education, I want it definitely understood that the ideas expressed in Dr. Goldthorpe's letter are not in conformity with the views and the policy of this office, and I will take steps to see that such statements are not made in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, February 19, after special orders heretofore entered.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE DUKE OF WINDSOR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include remarks I made in 1939 and also a speech by the Duke of

Windsor which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ANNUAL REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 356)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Annual Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1952.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PARTICIPATION IN OLYMPIC GAMES BY MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

COORDINATING LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF BOSTON, MASS.

The Clerk called the house joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2131) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior

to investigate and report to the Congress on conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Hawaii explain this proposal?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this very simple resolution is to authorize agencies of the Department of the Interior to undertake investigations of the water resources in the Territory of Hawaii, in areas that cannot be explored by private enterprise.

The people of Hawaii have developed very extensive sugar industries through irrigation systems that were financed entirely by private funds. The economy of the Territory is based on one crop. We now hope to diversify our economy by exploring the water resources in areas that cannot be undertaken by private resources, and therefore we request this authorization to enlist the services of the Government in that field.

Mr. FORD. According to the proposal it is to authorize \$250,000 annually for the undertaking of surveys for water utilization in the Hawaiian Islands. It is somewhat incongruous for us to authorize new authorizations of this sort when there is a very definite pinch on the availability of funds for authorizations which are already approved. It seems like we are compounding our troubles if we authorize new ones when we do not have enough money for the ones that are already on the shelf.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Let me say in reply to that, that this development is important from the standpoint of national defense, because at the present time we of Hawaii import almost two-thirds of all the food that we consume. That constitutes a very serious weakness. One way to overcome that is to develop irrigation in areas where crops can be grown. That has been the objective of the people of the Territory for many years, but we have never had the co-operation of the Federal Government, which we feel is necessary to do it. At the present time they are establishing in Hawaii the only permanent overseas base for the United States Marines. They are expanding operations at Pearl Harbor. They are increasing the air facilities. Everyone recognizes that Hawaii is the most important point of defense in the western part of the country.

I think it is about time that we undertook to overcome that weakness. I believe that even though you inaugurate the study now it probably will be 3 or 4 years before we can really come to the point of a project. This, in my opinion, is long overdue and is important from the national standpoint as well as the Hawaiian standpoint.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill comes out of the committee of which I happen to be a member; it came out unanimously. It does, of course, call for the expenditure of some money, but I

think the membership will realize that the money spent on exploring and developing the water resources and in utilizing the full productiveness of the land through irrigation far outweighs the money that might be put out for the development of these resources.

Actually, we have more funds in the foreign aid bill, for aid to 40 countries all over the world than we have in all the appropriation bills for the development of the resources of our own country, States, and Territories; and I hope the gentleman from Michigan will permit the bill to be considered, because I think it is wise legislation and a step in developing the water resources of Hawaii that is needed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct; this bill was voted out unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I think he is correct in his reasoning in support of it along with the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the development of Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make continuing investigations relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii and to report thereon, with appropriate recommendations, from time to time, to the President and the Congress.

Sec. 2. Prior to the transmission of any such report on a project to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies thereof for information and comment to the Governor of Hawaii, or to such representative as may be named by him, and to the heads of interested Federal departments and agencies. The written views and recommendations of the aforementioned officials may be submitted to the Secretary within 90 days from the day of receipt of said proposed report. The Secretary may thereafter transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, his report, together with copies of the views and recommendations received from the aforementioned officials. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike out the following words "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the following words "not to exceed \$2,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5490) relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE COPYRIGHT LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MOUNT OLIVET CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5598) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described parcel of land in Salt Lake County, Utah:

Beginning at the southeast corner of land of the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association granted by act of Congress, approved January 23, 1909, which likewise is the southwest corner of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah; thence north no degrees eight minutes forty seconds west along the westerly boundary of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation two thousand eight hundred thirteen and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to a point, which point is the northwest corner of lands described in a deed of easement from the United States of America to the State of Utah for public-highway purposes, dated June 29, 1948, and recorded in land records of Salt Lake County, Utah, October 2, 1948, in book 638, page 68; thence east no degrees no minutes no seconds a distance of ten and six-tenths feet; thence south no degrees eight minutes forty seconds east and parallel to the westerly boundary of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation two thousand eight hundred thirteen and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to the south boundary of said reservation; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes fifty seconds west a distance of ten and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Sec. 2. The deed of conveyance shall provide that the parcel of land so conveyed shall be used only for cemetery purposes and that if the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association ceases to use such parcel for those pur-

poses or attempts to alienate all or any part of such parcel, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. The deed of conveyance shall contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFORM RATES OF PENSION FOR VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5717) to provide uniform rates of pension for veterans of the Indian wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING FURTHER PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR AN ACTIVE PSYCHOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, according to information that has come to me the Veterans' Administration says the cost of this proposed legislation would be very substantial. I think it is fair to state that the cost of this proposed legislation would be substantially more than the \$1,000,000 limitation which the objector's committee has set as the basic criterion for consideration on the Consent Calendar; also, I am told that the Bureau of the Budget has not made a report on this legislation. This means we are unable to determine whether it is in accordance with the program of the President.

I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection and ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DIRECT HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5893) to make additional funds available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for direct home and farmhouse loans to eligible veterans, under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill is to come up under a suspension of the rules. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MOUND CITY GROUP NATIONAL MONUMENT, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5951) to add certain federally owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described Federal lands, comprising approximately 10½ acres of the Veterans' Administration hospital property, Chillicothe, Ohio, are hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior:

Beginning at the intersection of the north boundary line of the Mound City Group National Monument and the east line of Ohio State Highway No. 104; thence northerly along the east line of said highway for a distance of 300 feet; thence easterly and parallel with the north boundary of said monument to the west bank of the Scioto River; thence southerly along the west bank of said river to the north boundary line of said monument; thence westerly along the north boundary line of said monument to the point of beginning.

Hereafter this land shall be a part of the Mound City Group National Monument, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, and subject, also, to the condition that the Veterans' Administration shall retain, for such length of time as required by it, the use of the incinerator and access roads, and water pipe leading thereto which are now located upon the said lands, and the use of the present railroad track across the lands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OWYHEE IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5633) to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author or some member of the committee several questions with reference to the bill.

As I understand, this particular legislation refers to the contracts which were originally signed by the interested parties for the payment of fees for the water benefits. It was set up on a definite schedule agreed to by the Government and the private parties involved. Now we find there was a miscalculation and as a result these contracts have to be renegotiated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say that these numerous irrigation projects have been set up 25, 30, or 40 years ago and the payments on the contracts have been made as they came due; but we are advised that some of them need to be renegotiated. We have nine irrigation

projects that have voted for renegotiation of contract so that the payments can be made. I do not think it will cost the Federal Government one penny and I believe the contracts will be paid out. It is a matter of convenience for these irrigation districts to have a renegotiation and rescheduling of the basis so that they can meet the payments as they become due. The record shows that the mandatory contract has been voted upon favorably by the water users of the irrigation districts in the States of Idaho and Oregon that are concerned.

This is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. I think it is merely a matter of bookkeeping more or less. Of course, it is unfortunate that some of these earlier contracts were misjudged and we were a little bit optimistic about them. This is one of several bills that will come up asking for an extension of time for repayment on these contracts. I think I have stated the situation correctly. If not, the chairman may correct me, but I think I have stated it correctly. Under the new schedule of repayments, the payments can be made and will be made.

Mr. FORD. As I read the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. William E. Warne, it seems that approximately \$1,000,000 have been paid on the contracts, but there is an unpaid balance of a little over \$18,000,000. Does the gentleman have any idea how long these contracts have been in effect?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They have been in effect different lengths of time. One goes back to 1928, one goes back only 5 years. There are nine contracts. You will find in the last sentence of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Warne, he states:

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

If you do not extend the contracts and permit these people to pay out, they will not be paid. Now, you do not get blood out of a turnip. While it will come eventually, we must give them additional time.

Mr. FORD. The rate of payment has not been very good. Only \$1,000,000 have been paid and \$18,000,000 plus unpaid and there are still others to be renegotiated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. Some of these earlier contracts were in default. They were too optimistic as to what the landowners could do about the contracts. It is now either renewal or, I suppose the Federal Government could foreclose the contracts and have some land on its hands which it will eventually lose. I say let the people stay on the land and work out a new contract to make the payments.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Again the gentleman from Nebraska has stated the case I think correctly. There are several of the older reclamation projects that, as the gentleman from Nebraska has said,

were not figured accurately enough so that they find themselves now in distress. We used to handle them and give relief by moratorium, but we want to get away from that unbusinesslike way of doing it. We now have legislation permitting renegotiation of contracts. That is a laborious proposition. It is one that the Secretary of the Interior through his agent, the Bureau of Reclamation, attempts to renegotiate to the mutual satisfaction of the Government and the water users in such district.

We have tried to get this process by law on a businesslike basis so that the payments are feasible or can be made so. I think myself it is a good proposition. Of course, I regret that no more than \$1,000,000 has been paid up to now. But we feel now if we have a new contract it will be possible to go ahead with the repayments.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman from Arizona know how many contracts such as this one are in default which require renegotiation and a new contract and set-up?

Mr. MURDOCK. During the last few years we have brought about renegotiation of contract on at least 12 or 15 such projects. I think possibly there may be in the entire West a dozen more which will be calling for renegotiation. This is 1 of perhaps 25 or 30. Now I happen to know personally about some of these, and I do know that it was a good business proposition. I do not know personally about this one, but I think the gentleman from Nebraska stated the situation quite well.

Mr. FORD. The record to date in this particular contract is not too good.

Mr. MURDOCK. I admit that.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amendatory repayment contract dated August 29, 1951, with the Gem irrigation district, the Ridgeview irrigation district, the Owyhee irrigation district, the Ontario-Myssa irrigation district, the Advancement irrigation district, the Payette-Oregon Slope irrigation district, the Crystal irrigation district, the Bench irrigation district, and the Slide irrigation district, which contract has been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) is hereby approved and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute it on behalf of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMIT MINING ON CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 472) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTMENT OF SCREEN VEHICLE MAIL CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 759) to extend to screen-vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in regard to this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the Eightieth Congress legislation was passed providing that star-route contracts, at expiration, may be renewed for another 4-year period at the prevailing rate of pay of the first contract at the discretion of the Postmaster General, and also providing that the Postmaster General could renegotiate these contracts on account of increased or decreased costs which had occurred since the contract was awarded.

This bill merely provides that screen-wagon operators shall be brought under this bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. In other words, at the present time these screen-wagon contracts are let for a 4-year period. At the end of 4 years they are put up again for open competitive bidding. If this bill is passed—and I might say it already has received favorable action by the other body—these contracts of these screen-wagon contractors may be renewed for a 4-year period at the discretion of the Postmaster General at the prevailing rate of pay that the screen-wagon contractor is now receiving, and it also provides that the Postmaster General may renegotiate the contracts due to increased or decreased costs.

I might say that this legislation has the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget and is favored by the screen-wagon contractors. There are only 173 screen-wagon contractors in the United States today. They operate 489 vehicles. Their contracts now must be let every 4 years under open competitive bidding. This legislation will prevent a lot of cut-throat bidding which has occurred in the past and will, in the end, save the Department money. I might say that the law passed by the Eightieth Congress, allowing the star-route contractors' contracts to be renewed, has worked very satisfactorily.

Now, these screen-wagon contractors have to provide trucks or conveyances according to the specifications of the Post Office Department. They must be protected because of the fact that these screen-wagon contractors carry registered mail from the railroad station to the post office, and naturally the screen-

wagon contractors have to make a heavy investment when they first receive the contract, and I believe in view of the fact that they have to make this heavy investment, and that they are experienced, that their contracts should be renewed by the Postmaster General if he finds that their services have been satisfactory in the past.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I notice in the report that the General Accounting Office did not recommend favorably on this legislation. There is a letter in the report from the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, in which he states that he does not recommend favorable consideration of the removal of the competitive bidding requirement on screen-vehicle contracts as proposed by S. 759, which principle, I understand, is the same as this. I have such a high regard for Lindsay C. Warren and his desire to save money for the taxpayers that I am inclined to think that there is some merit in his position when he fails to recommend favorably. He must feel that the competitive bidding would save money to the taxpayer rather than giving the Postmaster General the right to extend this and include the screen-vehicle situation along with the star route without competitive bids, and particularly do I notice that the Postmaster General will have the right to adjust the compensation either upward or downward during that 4-year period.

In view of what I have just said, and the report of Lindsay C. Warren, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he feel that this bill will save the taxpayer money or cost the taxpayer money beyond what it is now paying?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think in the long run that this bill will save the taxpayers money, because you will have experienced screen-wagon contractors, and the Postmaster General will certainly use his discretion and best judgment as to whether to give another 4-year contract to a present contractor or not. I think the Comptroller General is in error on this point. He says that opposition to this bill is based upon the fact that screen vehicle service was not deemed comparable with star-route service in that the latter service was more in the nature of a service performed by an individual whereas the screen vehicle service was not. I cannot agree with that because these screen-wagon operators are individuals who are operating these screen wagons and trucks between post office and the railroad station in the same town, and between the main post office and branches or stations of the main post office in the same town.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wonder if he did not have in mind also powerboat contractors on inland waters. This is the main reason for his objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. They are not included in this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. He refers to it in his report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That legislation was considered by a previous Congress.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman state whether or not this is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It is; yes, sir.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman assures us that this will not cost the taxpayer more money, and in all probability may save the taxpayers money, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That (a) clause (1) of the next to last paragraph of section 3951 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 434), is amended by inserting after the words "star-route" the words "or screen vehicle service."

(b) Clause (2) of such paragraph is amended by inserting after the word "route" wherever it appears in such clause the words "or contract."

(c) The last paragraph of such section is amended by inserting after the words "star-route" the words "or screen vehicle service."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. AYRES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce to the House the death last night of William A. Ayres, a member of the Federal Trade Commission, and a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. Ayres was born in Elizabeth, Hardin County, Ill., April 19, 1867. He moved to Sedgwick County, Kans., with his parents in 1881. He was admitted to the Kansas bar in 1893, and commenced the practice of law in Wichita that year. From 1897 to 1901, he served as clerk of the court of appeals of Kansas. He was county attorney of Sedgwick County from 1906 to 1910, and was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress in 1914. He was reelected to the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses and with exception of the Sixty-seventh Congress was a Member of succeeding Congresses up to and including the Seventy-third. He served over 17 years altogether in the House of Representatives. He resigned from the House of Representatives on August 22, 1934, to become a member of the Federal Trade Commission to which he had been appointed by President Roosevelt. He has served continuously as a member of the Commission since that time. For 3 years, 1937, 1942, and 1946 he served as Chairman of the Commission.

Mrs. Ayres passed away in 1934. Mr. Ayres is survived by his three daughters, Mrs. Kathryn Nichols, of Westfield, N. J.; Mrs. Pauline Williams, of Chevy Chase, Md.; and Mrs. W. Frederick Weigester, of Washington, D. C.

XCVIII—69

During his long service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Ayres was known as an able and hard-working Member. He was a careful and conscientious student of legislative matters and no Member was more diligent in representing the interests of his constituents than he. For many years, he served on the Committee on Appropriations, and at the time of his retirement was chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. He was appointed to the Federal Trade Commission at a time in life when many men are thinking of retiring, yet he lived to give almost 20 years of able and distinguished service on that body, during a time when many questions of great and far-reaching importance were up for consideration.

The high esteem with which Mr. Ayres was held in Kansas is shown by the fact that he was repeatedly elected as a Democrat from a strong Republican district. To those who knew Bill Ayres, this was easy to explain because I never have known a man who had a greater capacity for friendship, or who had more real friends among those with whom he came in contact than Bill Ayres. This was true regardless of politics, both on the floor of the House and in his district. His repeated reelections were of course a tribute to the service he rendered his district and the country, but they were also an expression of friendship from those who knew and loved him.

I feel I have suffered a deep personal loss in the death of Mr. Ayres. When I came to Congress as a new Member, no one took a more kindly interest in me and my work than did Mr. Ayres. I shall never forget the kindnesses and courtesies which he showed me at that time. To his daughters and their families I extend my most sincere sympathy in the great bereavement which has come to them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to endorse everything the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has said about the life and character of our late colleague and friend Bill Ayres. I have never known a more popular man in this House, on both sides of the aisle, than was Mr. Ayres. His Republican colleagues from Kansas liked and admired him as much as they did their Republican colleagues. Everyone on either side of the aisle knew that when Will Ayres took this floor he was going to make a statement that had meat in it; that he had sane and sound judgment, and that he was a splendid legislator. In addition to that, he was one of the most splendid gentlemen that it has ever been my privilege to know. I knew Mrs. Ayres. She passed away some years ago, but to his lovely daughters and other relatives remaining I want to express my deepest regret and my sincerest sympathy on the loss of this wonderful father and this splendid American.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Bill Ayres' name was presented several times to the national convention of his party as a favorite-son candidate for the Presidency from his native Kansas.

I first came to know this great Kansan through my late chief and predecessor, Congressman Seger, who always held that Bill Ayres was one of the finest men that ever lived. I was then a young secretary but this Congressman from the Midwest had time for me and from our very first meeting he called me by my first name. Years passed, Congressman Seger was called away, and Bill Ayres became a Federal Trade Commissioner. Recently, I had occasion to call upon him regarding cases involving fraudulent branding and advertising by foreign manufacturers seeking to steal American markets. It was not necessary for me to introduce myself. He was, as always, his most pleasant, gracious self and he went out of his way to make my constituents feel at home. He saw immediately the justice of their cause and he started in motion FTC machinery which is now righting the wrongs that have been done.

I am deeply saddened over the passing of this highly principled gentleman and public servant.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It was a great shock to me when I learned of the passing of Bill Ayres. I had not heard of it until the gentleman made his statement a few moments ago.

I wish to join in everything that has been said about this fine and distinguished statesman, with whom I served for many years, and whom I have known and admired all the time he has served on the Federal Trade Commission.

I want to extend my sympathy to his daughters, and to all the other members of his family. I do not hesitate to say that I have never known a finer American than Bill Ayres of Kansas.

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the life and character of the late Honorable Will Ayres.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 5, 1952, the Chair designates the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1952.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
LABOR

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education and Labor may have permission to sit in hearings during general debate for the balance of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR DIRECT
HOUSING LOANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5893) to make additional funds available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for direct home and farmhouse loans to eligible veterans, under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by adding the following subsection (d):

"(d) For the purposes of further augmenting the revolving fund established in subsection (a) hereof the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed between the effective date of this subsection and July 1, 1952, to make available to the Administrator such additional sums not in excess of \$25,000,000 as the Administrator may request, and is authorized and directed to advance from time to time thereafter until June 30, 1953, such additional sums as the Administrator may request, provided that the aggregate so advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of \$25,000,000 less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title. Except for the limitation on the sums authorized in subsection (a) hereof, this subsection shall be subject to the other provisions of this section and of this title."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that upon termination of debate on this bill the question of the vote on suspending the rules and passing the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. To be taken up the first thing tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. To be the unfinished business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 5893, as reported to the House, authorizes \$125,000,000 additional for direct housing loans through the Veterans' Administration to be made available in installments of \$25,000,000 each quarter. The previous sum of \$150,000,000 has been entirely allocated by the Veterans' Administration for these \$10,000 loans which bear interest at the rate of 4 percent.

Under law approved during the first session of this Congress, the Veterans' Administration was authorized to sell mortgages held by it on loans of this type to private banks and investment groups. Today the Veterans' Administration is engaged in a campaign to sell \$108,000,000 of such mortgages. If this campaign is successful, the authorization provided in this bill will be reduced by whatever amount the Veterans' Administration recovers from the sale of such loans.

Testimony received by the subcommittee which considered this proposal indicates that the default rate on such loans is less than one-half of one percent which means that the Government will ultimately make a profit on this operation.

It should be stressed that these loans are made in nonmetropolitan areas only and that they are made by the Veterans' Administration only after every opportunity has been given the banks and other lending agencies to make the loan. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the history of these loans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HISTORY OF DIRECT HOUSING LOANS

The authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct housing loans where private financing was not available was first provided by an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as a section of a general housing bill which ultimately became Public Law 475 of the Eighty-first Congress. The text of the section applicable to the question of direct loans follows:

"SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

"Sec. 512. (a) Upon application by a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make, or enter into a commitment to make, the veteran a loan to finance the purchase or construction of a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home, or to finance the construction or improvement of a farmhouse, if (1) the Administrator has found, after the effective date of this section, that in the area in which the dwelling or farmhouse is located or is to be constructed private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, or the construc-

tion or improvement of farmhouses, as the case may be, by veterans under this title, and (2) the veteran shows to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

"(A) that he is a satisfactory credit risk, "(B) that the monthly payments to be required under the proposed loan bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses,

"(C) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area at an interest rate not in excess of 4 percent per annum a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 501 or section 502 of this title, and

"(D) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or the Housing Act of 1949.

"(b) Loans made under this section shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum and shall be subject to such requirements or limitations prescribed for loans guaranteed under this title as may be applicable: *Provided, That—*

"(A) the original principal amount of any such loan shall not exceed \$10,000;

"(B) the guaranty entitlement of the veteran shall be charged with the same amount that would be deducted if the loan had been guaranteed to the maxima permitted under section 500 (a) of this title;

"(C) the amount of loans made under this section shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and

"(D) the authority to make loans under this section shall expire June 30, 1951.

"(c) In connection with any loan under this section, the Administrator is authorized to make advances in cash to pay the taxes and assessments on the real estate, to provide for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, and improvements, and to meet the incidental expenses of the transaction, and shall credit to the principal of the loan an amount equal to that which would have been payable under section 500 (c) of this title had the loan been made by a private institution.

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to sell, and shall offer for sale, to any private lending institution evidencing ability to service loans, any loan made under this section at a price not less than par; that is, the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, and may guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the purchaser entitled to an automatic guaranty under section 500 (a) of this title.

"(e) This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of the Housing Act of 1950.

"Sec. 513. (a) For the purposes of section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums, not in excess of \$150,000,000, as the Administrator shall request from time to time except that no sums may be made available after June 30, 1951. After the last day on which the Administrator may make loans under that section, he shall cause to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, that part of all sums in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (c) of this section, and all moneys received thereafter, representing unexpended advances or the repayment or recovery of the principal of loans made pursuant to section 512 of this title. Interest collected by the Administrator on loans made under section 512 in excess of the amount payable by him to the Treasurer of the United States under subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous income or credits, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said obligations. The Administrator shall have power to invest such reserves, or any

unexpended part thereof, from time to time in obligations of the Government of the United States.

"(b) On advances by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (a) of this section, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsections (a) and (c) hereof the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the advance.

"(c) In order to make available the sums payable under subsection (a) of this section and to effectuate the purposes and functions authorized in section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, are hereby extended to include such purposes. Such sums, together with all receipts hereunder, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, in a special deposit account, and shall be available, respectively, for disbursement for the purposes of section 512 of this title. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in said account as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes for which they were provided, including the proceeds of the sale of any loans, and not later than June 30, 1952, he shall cause to be so deposited all sums in said account and all moneys received thereafter in repayment of outstanding obligations, or otherwise, except so much thereof as he may determine to be necessary for purposes of liquidation. Without regard to any other provisions of this title, said Administrator shall have authority to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, and realization or sale of such investments, to determine his necessary expenses and expenditures, and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, to make such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the carrying out of the functions hereby or hereunder authorized and, except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of his functions hereunder to, such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate."

Section 614 of Public Law 139 of the Eighty-second Congress, further amended the direct loan provision by extending the authority to make such loans for two additional years, or until June 30, 1953. In addition, this law provided for the creation of a revolving fund permitting repayments on loans to be used to make additional loans and also permitting the sale of previously made loans, thus creating additional funds for the original purpose of the act. Some \$92,000 in these direct loans have been sold to private banks or investment houses of which over \$310,000 additional is now pending in the Veterans' Administration. The text of section 614 of the Public Law 139 follows:

"Sec. 614. (a) Section 512 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended (1) by striking out clause (C); and (2) by striking out 'June 30, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1953.'"

"(b) Section 512 (d) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to sell, and shall offer for sale, to any private lending institution evidencing ability to service loans, any loan made under this section at a price not less than par; that is, the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, and may guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under section 501 (b) of this title."

"(c) The first sentence of section 513 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows: 'For the purposes of section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums not in excess of \$150,000,000 (plus the amount of any funds which may have been deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts under subsections (a) and (c) hereof), as the Administrator shall request from time to time except that no sums may be made available after June 30, 1953.'

"(d) Section 513 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1952' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1954.'"

H. R. 5893 AS REPORTED

"That section 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by adding the following subsection (d):

"(d) For the purposes of further augmenting the revolving fund established in subsection (a) hereof the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed between the effective date of this subsection and July 1, 1952, to make available to the Administrator such additional sums not in excess of \$25,000,000 as the Administrator may request, and is authorized and directed to advance from time to time thereafter until June 30, 1953, such additional sums as the Administrator may request, provided that the aggregate so advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of \$25,000,000 less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title. Except for the limitation on the sums authorized in subsection (a) hereof, this subsection shall be subject to the other provisions of this section and of this title."

Mr. RANKIN. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the subcommittee which it was my honor to head carefully considered this bill. We studied all aspects of the situation and arrived at the conclusion that this bill is in the interest of our country and the veterans particularly at this time.

The default rate on these loans in the past has been less than one-half of 1 percent, which is much less than on loans we commonly see in the banking business and other lending institutions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That does not mean that the Government has even lost one-half of 1 percent; it means merely that that amount is in default and may require foreclosures, but the Government has not lost anything yet.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Applications for these loans are coming in every day to the Veterans' Administration and the money has been exhausted. Before these loans are made the applicants are carefully investigated, and no loan is made where the veteran has not exhausted every available opportunity to get the loan elsewhere.

This bill is primarily for rural areas. The testimony shows that loans will be made available in areas less than a hundred thousand population, and in the great majority of cases less than 25,000 population. I believe it is needed at this time to supply a need in communities where loans are not available at the proper interest rate.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I have heard that comment made in the past, that these loans are for the nonmetropolitan areas. Is there some plausible reason why they are limited to nonmetropolitan areas?

Mr. DORN. Yes; for the simple reason that in the great metropolitan areas it has been found that normal lending agencies can take care of them and that the money is available at reasonable rates of interest if the applicants can show themselves worthy of the loans. In some rural areas the income from the farm may not be as high or as steady as the income of a worker in a great metropolitan area where as a rule it is steadier than it is on the farm.

I think this bill does supply a real need. I hope the House will enact this legislation to provide \$125,000,000 for additional loans. This is not going to be used until every other means has been exhausted to give the veteran the loan. The appropriations of last year have all been used and this is an urgent need.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in the metropolitan areas there is money available at 4 percent to the veterans to secure loans?

Mr. DORN. Much more so than in the rural areas.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Has the gentleman ever made a study out in the country to ascertain that? When I was home recently I found it extremely difficult to find any ex-serviceman who could secure money at 4 percent as authorized under the bills.

Mr. DORN. I believe the facts will show that it is still much more easily obtained in a large metropolitan area than in a smaller rural community.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I agree with the gentleman, no doubt that is true. The only thing I challenge is the statement about the metropolitan area. In the metropolitan areas we find it very difficult to secure any money at 4 percent for the veterans, although the Government guarantees the loan. Is the committee considering anything that may deal with the metropolitan area in that regard?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think I have run across the same set of facts that the gentleman just gave to the gentleman from South Carolina. A great many of the banks up our way do not like to be concerned or bothered with these particular loans due to the fact they figure they are not getting enough of an interest rate. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the amount asked for in this bill. As I understand it, there is a total of only \$25,000,000 for each quarter until the act expires in 1953?

Mr. DORN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In further reference to what the gentleman from Colorado had to say, the testimony before the subcommittee was to the effect that while these loans were primarily for rural areas, and that is the announced policy for this type of loan, yet there were two, and possibly three, areas or communities within the United States of over 100,000 population in which such loans were being made. There were two certainly, and possibly a third, in which these loans were made under rules followed by the Veterans' Administration. The statement did not include those areas.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. As I understand the gentleman, he indicates that these loans are to be made available to buy farms?

Mr. DORN. No, just houses.

Mr. NELSON. Not confined to farms?

Mr. DORN. Homes. May I say that this is a good bill, it is worthy, and it will not cost the United States Government 1 cent because the money will be paid back. It will encourage something that is vitally needed among our returning veterans—home ownership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker this is a powerful contribution, not only for the veterans, but toward the strengthening of our Government and our society because any time we pass legislation that enables extension of home ownership or ownership of any kind where the fee simple and title will be in possession of those who make the purchase, we are not only strengthening our Government but we are strengthening American society, because the strength of a government is dependent upon the strength of the family life of a nation. Where you find strong family life you will find a strong government; where you find weak family life you will find a weak government.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is correct. These veterans who have returned need to be encouraged to this extent; and, furthermore, a bill of this nature will encourage our private lending agen-

cies to be more considerate of this need among our people.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire and will reserve the balance of the unused time.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this measure. It was a wise move when this provision was incorporated in the GI bill of rights. The boys coming back from World War II and the Korean conflict dream of homes. The boys out in the various veterans' hospitals are asking about loans to build homes. We know how difficult it is today for boys in the small communities of less than 100,000 to secure these loans. I wish more could be done about getting the banks to make these loans in the cities. Perhaps something may be done later on in reference to that.

Mr. Speaker, this is not throwing money away, as some people would say, when legislation of this sort is passed. This money will come back again to the Treasury, and the Treasury may even make a profit from this act. This bill was reported favorably by the unanimous vote of the committee, and I cannot conceive of anyone objecting to its enactment. I would like to see the bill acted upon right now without delay. The amount asked for is not an expenditure; it is an investment in the future of our young veterans. Future generations will realize upon this investment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], a very wise veteran, one who is much interested in veterans' legislation and one who has made an exhaustive study of this measure as a member of the subcommittee having it in charge.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I think it may be of some interest to the House to know of some of the factors considered by the committee in determining to report out this bill. It was felt that there were two prime considerations. The first was, of course, to protect the financial integrity and the economic well-being of our Nation. The other was to take care adequately of the veterans of our wars.

As has already been pointed out, we feel from the standpoint of economy that this bill is entirely sound, because it will not only not cost the Government anything, but in the long run will bring more money into the Federal Treasury. It is a loan program and not a give-away program. At the same time it is felt that it will do the thing which has previously been mentioned here, that is, make it possible for deserving veterans to purchase homes.

Now just a few figures may be of interest in that connection. According to the testimony before the committee applications for these loans are being made at the rate of about \$10,000,000 per month. It has apparently leveled off, at least for the time being, at about that figure. You will observe that this bill makes available during the next five quarters the sum of \$25,000,000 each quarter, so that it is readily understandable that by this arrangement we are

able to take care of about all of the loan applications which will be filed by the veterans.

There is another interesting fact about this matter. The terms of the first loan were to extend until June of this year. That was in the amount of \$150,000,000. As of December 31 there had been—and I am speaking now only in round numbers—about \$134,000,000 entirely allocated, and approximately \$13,000,000 more tentatively allocated, meaning that there was between \$147,000,000 and \$148,000,000 of the first \$150,000,000 which had been allocated. That means that there is something over \$2,000,000 left. In the meantime about \$4,000,000 had come back; had been recaptured by means of repayment into this fund, so that there was a total of about \$6,000,000 left for the purpose of making these home loans, at the conclusion of the calendar year 1951.

I must caution the House to make a distinction here between a guaranteed loan, that is, a loan under the so-called GI Bill of Rights, whereby the loan is guaranteed, and this type of loan, which is a direct loan to veterans. The limit on each individual loan under this act continues to be \$10,000.

There is a further provision that as these funds are regarded, and properly so, as a revolving fund, as payments of principal and interest upon those loans already made are returned to the Veterans Administration, they are available for reloaning. Those amounts have been coming in at the approximate rate of between \$400,000 and \$500,000 per month. On the total loan amount of \$150,000,000 as now provided, the maximum return per month is anticipated to be about \$500,000, so that the House will readily see there will not be enough money available from the payments of principal and interest to carry the program forward. Of course, if we do make this additional amount available, the monthly returns will be correspondingly increased.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to underscore this phase of the legislation. The proposed bill provides that there will be made available the sum of \$25,000,000 between now and July 1, and then the further sum of \$25,000,000 each quarter-year thereafter until June 30, 1953; in other words, the total amount that may be available will be \$125,000,000, but the \$25,000,000 each quarter is to be reduced by the amount of money that has come in as the result of the sale of mortgages by the Government to private agencies each quarter. In other words, to take an example, if in one quarter \$5,000,000 should be sold, then from the Treasury of the United States would have to come only an additional \$20,000,000. By that, I repeat, we feel we have gone far in protecting our financial integrity and our economic security.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is where the property is sold and, I suppose, they take some kind of a mortgage, and where the mortgage is sold to a bank.

Mr. ADAIR. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. But, as to interest payments maintained in the Veterans' Administration, those interest payments stay in the revolving fund of that agency.

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I would like to ask the same question I asked a few minutes ago, and pursue it further, and I do so with no intention of harpooning the bill. I shall support the suspension of the rule, and shall support the legislation. But, I am just a little bit puzzled as to what answer I have for a veteran who lives in a large metropolitan part of my district and finds himself unable to get a loan for a home at 4 percent while in the outlying parts of the district, in the rural counties, they find such loans available. What answer do I have for that man when he asks me why I supported a bill which would give a very small part of the veterans of my district access to this money at 4 percent while the man from the metropolitan area has to pay 6 percent as the gentleman from Colorado stated. What argument do I have to that veteran in Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. ADAIR. The answer to that Mr. Speaker, I think, is that given by the gentleman from South Carolina, and that is by this amendment we do not change the announced policy of previously existing legislation. This legislation initially, if I am correctly informed, was passed as an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It became effective, I think, in April 1950. This, as I say, did not change the policy which was heretofore established.

Mr. WIER. By that do you mean the intent of this law is to carry on the 4 percent interest charge on veterans' loans for homes?

Mr. ADAIR. In rural areas, accordingly to the announced intent.

Mr. WIER. I am thinking about the veterans in the metropolitan areas. That is the situation which bothers me. I have 10 veterans in my district to every 1 that I have in the rural parts of my district.

Mr. ADAIR. The evidence before the committee, and I take it was the evidence before the committee which held hearings on the legislation previously was that money for the purchase of homes was more readily available in urban than in rural areas. I recognize there is much truth, however, in what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I commend the gentleman for his explanation of the provisions of this bill, and subjects related thereto. Like the gentleman from Minnesota, I find myself in somewhat a little different position because I represent a metropolitan area. However, there are suburbs adjoining my district, where I understand this 4 percent money is available as explained

by the gentleman. The query that I would like to make is whether or not your committee has to date considered legislation which may cure the situation where veterans in metropolitan areas find themselves unable to secure loans at the guaranteed rate through private financial institutions. In other words, has that been discussed in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and is there any proposed legislation involving that?

Mr. ADAIR. There was discussion at one point, at the time these hearings were held before the subcommittee, but to my knowledge there is no pending legislation to change that situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If there should develop legislation which would increase the interest rate on these guaranteed loans say from 4 percent to 5 percent, as some of the people who are financing these homes are recommending, do you think if that were presented to the House, it would result in an inequality, and does the gentleman not think that it actually would result in an inequality between the metropolitan areas and the rural areas?

Mr. ADAIR. It would seem to be so, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If they are unable to secure loans at 4 percent in the metropolitan areas, then we have to either extend them to the metropolitan areas or increase the interest rate, which would still leave an inequality. Yet, so far no bill has been considered by the committee to meet the problem as it deals with the metropolitan area?

Mr. ADAIR. No, sir; not to my knowledge. With regard to the matter of interest rates, I might say to the gentleman, and as a matter of general information for the Members of the House, the latest report which we have had as to the sale of these existing mortgages does not indicate they are being purchased by private investors very rapidly. About the middle of December, \$108,000,000 worth of these mortgages were made available to private purchasers by the Veterans' Administration. My information is that to this date, \$92,500 have been purchased. There are bids on something over \$300,000 beyond that. But, the gentleman will see that they are not moving very rapidly, and I am told that one reason they are not moving is because of the relatively low interest rate for such types of investment.

I should like to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that we have considered this measure carefully. We believe it does the things which I said initially, and that is to take care of the veteran and at the same time protect the interests of our Government. I believe it is sound legislation, and should be passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

This bill, when passed, will enable the great program of direct loans by the Veterans' Administration to veterans living in rural areas where private financing is not available to go forward, and will enable those veterans of World War II

living in rural areas to enjoy the same benefits as have been enjoyed by those living in our cities where the United States-guaranteed loans have been made by the thousands.

HISTORY OF DIRECT HOME-LOAN LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. Speaker, when the GI bill was enacted in 1944, it was contemplated that the liberal guaranty to be made under its terms to private lending concerns would be sufficient to induce such lending agencies to meet the home loan needs of all veterans of World War II. However, in practice, it worked out that the lending agencies made practically all loans to veterans living in cities and neglected or refused to make loans to those veterans living in rural areas. Those of us representing rural districts here sensed this inadequacy, and came to the conclusion that the only way in which the rural veteran could receive equitable treatment in the matter of obtaining a loan was to set up a system of direct loans to him by our Government. I believe it was not the desire of any of us to see the Government go into this lending field, but when it became apparent that private lending agencies would not make these loans in any substantial number, then the Congress in the Housing Act of 1950 authorized the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to those veterans who could not obtain them from private sources, for a period of 1 year, or until June 30, 1951, and appropriated \$150,000,000 to finance this program.

As June 30, 1951, approached it was apparent that the program should be continued for a period of time sufficient to allow all veterans living in rural areas an opportunity to qualify for a loan. I had the privilege of being the author of House bill 3861, which passed this House on June 18, 1951, and which provided that the system of direct home loans for World War II veterans be extended for an additional 2 years, or until June 30, 1953. The exact language of this bill later became section 614 of Public Law 139 of the Eighty-second Congress.

This new law set up a revolving fund wherein repayments on direct mortgage loans and the proceeds of sales of these mortgages to private financial institutions could be used to make additional loans. The Government now owns approximately \$150,000,000 worth of these direct mortgages, and, contrary to expectations of a year ago, these mortgages cannot be sold in any substantial volume or amount. Private financial institutions say in effect that the 4 percent interest which these mortgages bear is not a sufficiently high rate of interest for them, and that, therefore, they will not buy the mortgages from the Government, and thus, in effect, the program of direct GI home and farmhouse loans will be stopped. In the meantime, a large number of loan applications are pending. We are now faced with the proposition that we have a good home loan system for rural veterans of World War II, but no additional money with which to make the system work. The will of the Congress has been thwarted.

PASSAGE OF THIS BILL IS NECESSARY TO AID
VETERANS IN RURAL AREAS TO BUILD THEIR
HOMES

So, as I see it, it is necessary that we pass the bill before us in order to carry out the will of Congress that the home loan benefits of the GI bill be available to all veterans of World War II, wherever they may choose to live, whether in the large cities of New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit, or Atlanta, or in the rural communities of Manchester, Sumiton, Vina, Spruce Pine, Brooksville, Hayden, Crane Hill, Holly Pond, McShan, Ethelsville, Fernbank, Crews Depot, Glen Allen, Bankston, Brilliant, Bexar, Natural Bridge, or Falls City, and a hundred other rural communities in the Seventh Congressional District which I have the honor to represent here.

PASSAGE OF THIS BILL IS NOT A DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST OUR CITY VETERANS

Some of our colleagues here have inquired whether or not this bill will discriminate against veterans of their city districts. My answer to that inquiry is that it will not. This is shown by the fact that guaranteed GI loans have been made for the past 6 years or more, sometimes in the volume of \$200,000,000 a month or more. Practically all those loans were made in the more heavily populated areas. We seek by this bill to make GI loans available to those rural areas that were so long discriminated against in the matter of these home loans. This bill does not alter in any way the guaranteed-loan provisions of the GI bill. The effect of this bill, if any, on the city areas will be to encourage private lending facilities to go ahead and make more 4-percent loans, in both city and rural areas. To vote against this bill only draws the noose of higher interest rates a little tighter around the necks of both city and rural veterans.

PASSAGE OF THIS BILL WILL NOT COST THE
GOVERNMENT ANYTHING

Mr. Speaker, in these days of high costs of government, brought about primarily by the ever-increasing costs of defense, I feel that the Congress should go slow on any program that will entail large new costs to be borne by the taxpayers. One of the merits of this program is that it will not cost anything. The loans made will repay themselves. The experience to date has been that we have had practically no losses whatsoever on the direct loans that have been made during the past 2 years. It is my judgment that the interest rate of 4 percent will be sufficient throughout the life of the program to pay all costs of administration.

THE DIRECT HOME-LOAN PROGRAM STRENGTHENS
AMERICA

This direct home-loan program strengthens America. It strengthens the family life of America. It makes for stable homes. It spreads the benefits of our free-enterprise system, and thus makes our economic and social system stronger. It substitutes the security of home ownership for the insecurity of tenancy.

THIS PROGRAM DOES NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE
LENDING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Speaker, this program of direct loans for World War II veterans does not interfere or compete with private lending institutions. It operates only in a field in which private lending institutions have refused to operate. It is a field in which private lenders have been encouraged to go, by a liberal system of Government guaranties. The passage of this bill will go one step further in encouraging private lenders, in that every mortgage taken by the Government by a direct loan will first be offered to private lending agencies. If they refuse to make the loan, and the Government does make it, the mortgage will again be offered to private lenders throughout its life on a cost basis. I sincerely wish it were not necessary that we pass this bill. I would like to see all these loans made by private lending agencies. But, I am more interested in seeing that our rural veterans, and our small town veterans, are given every reasonable opportunity to become homeowners. They will not have this opportunity unless we pass this bill and provide an additional \$125,000,000 of credit for them. Perhaps the passage of this bill will encourage private lenders to make loans, or to buy loans made by the Government, to the end that no further authorization will be necessary.

HOME LOANS FOR KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is high time that we extend all Government housing benefits to the veterans of the Korean war. They are coming home now, in increasing numbers, and their needs in the field of housing should be provided for in the same manner, and to the same extent as is true for Veterans of World War II. I hope that legislation to accomplish this result will be before the House at an early date.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Assuming for example that a veteran lives in the City of New York, where you could not buy enough for a hat checkroom with \$10,000, but he wants to live out in Long Island, or up in Westchester County, or across the Hudson River in New Jersey. Although he is a veteran living in the city of New York and wants to move, does he come under this program, if he buys a home in an area outside of the large city?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not sure that I can answer that question, but I am under the impression that if he lives in an area that the Veterans' Administration has found does not have private lending facilities available, and builds his home in such an area, he would be entitled to a loan.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is exactly right. If he lives in New York or Detroit, or any other large city, and he wants to buy a home out away from that

city, he could do so under this bill, provided he wants to live there.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is directed in a manner in which it will assist many veterans throughout the entire country.

I am particularly interested in the provisions which make it possible for veterans residing in nonmetropolitan areas to receive the same financial benefits that are readily available for urban dwellers. Many rural and semirural areas do have difficulty in supplying sufficient financial aid to veterans to meet their construction demands. This direct-loan program alleviates the handicap with which they are thus confronted, and makes it possible for veterans to carry out the desired home and farm construction.

I believe this bill will aid materially in seeing that veterans in all areas are given equal financial advantages, by providing the means by which smaller communities will be able to meet their requirements. The successful operation of this program since its inception in July 1950 points out its need.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I always felt that the loans should be made directly to the veterans through the Veterans' Administration. That would help the veterans in the industrial and in all areas to secure loans when the banks will not loan them.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was agreed that this bill would be taken up the first thing tomorrow for a final vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that all debate is closed now?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. All debate is closed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas). The bill goes over until tomorrow as the unfinished business.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order following that of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. It being agreeable to him. I ask unanimous consent that I may precede him.

Mr. HARDY. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TESTIMONY DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR AMENDING WAGE AND HOUR LAW TO ENABLE MIGRANT WORKERS TO HELP HARVEST CROPS.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, when the wage and hour law was changed 2 years ago, an amendment was added in the

Senate which has been interpreted to mean that farmers can no longer hire children under 16 years of age to work in agriculture during the time a school is in session in the community where the work is being done. I take the position that control over school attendance is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States.

That amendment and the interpretation is working a severe hardship on cotton growers and on migrant families who make their living principally by picking cotton during the harvest season which occurs during the autumn. It is having the effect of throwing a lot of good people on relief rolls and of curtailing the harvesting of cotton and of other agricultural products. The Senate amendment should be repealed.

SHOULD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTROL LOCAL SCHOOL ATTENDANCE?

An issue that is even more fundamental is involved in this enlargement of Federal power. It has to do with a flaunting of the Constitution, a callous disregard for the separation between Federal and State responsibility with respect to local school attendance. The Constitution leaves control over schools and school attendance to the States and to local governments. But the Federal Government now enters the picture and undertakes, by indirection, to force the attendance in schools of all children under 16 years of age during the autumn harvest seasons.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor Department—which I understand sponsored the Senate amendment—has contended that the amendment was a good thing because it would have the effect of getting certain children to attend school who otherwise might not attend. The Secretary of Labor issued an official bulletin, entitled "Help Get Children Into School, and Out of Farm Jobs During School Hours." Vast numbers of these were scattered over the Nation. The bulletin deals with the Senate amendment to which I have referred.

That brings into focus the fundamental question involved here. Is it, under our Constitution, the business or the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, even by indirection, to determine when children should or should not attend school and for how long? Or is that a right and a responsibility reserved to the States?

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything sacred that is left to the States to handle without interference of Federal power and encroachment, it should be control over the education of the youth. Yet the bus; bodies in the various Federal bureaus are forever probing for an opening whereby even the education of little Johnnie in the remotest rural school will be under the paternal eye of a Washington bureaucrat. And the Labor Department has by the Senate amendment made a beachhead landing in its attempt to pierce the constitutional limitations upon its power.

Let us examine the issue a little further. In Texas we have a compulsory school-attendance law, as I assume is the case in all the States. I am sure we all

believe in compulsory school attendance. Each child must attend for a minimum of 120 days each year. But the State law permits local school boards, in their discretion, to give permission for a student to defer the beginning of the school year so long as the minimum compulsory attendance is met. In other words, a board may permit a child to begin school in November or December, for example, instead of in September when the school year begins. In practice, the vast majority of these migrant children attend school at least 9 months each year.

That policy over school attendance was made, Mr. Speaker, by the legislature of a sovereign State in accordance with its constitutional authority and responsibility. But the Senate amendment would, in effect, supersede and override that law and that policy. Now, in the face of that policy by the State, the Labor Department, acting under the Senate amendment, in effect, repeals the right of the local school board to defer the beginning of the school attendance during a school year for a student.

Now, I can understand that the Labor Department here in Washington may disagree with the wisdom of the Texas law that requires a minimum of only 6 months of compulsory school attendance. It may think the local school boards should not have authority to defer the beginning of a school year for a student. It may even think the number of hours a student attends school each day is too many or too few.

But, Mr. Speaker, is that, under our system of government, the business of the Federal Government or of a government bureau? Where are you going to draw the line? Where and at what point is this encroachment upon local control over the education of American youth going to end? Or is it going to end?

Why have an army of Federal employees running around over the country enforcing local school attendance? The Labor Department bulletin, to which I have previously referred, makes the Department's objective clear, and refers to farm employers being responsible for observing the new law "which reinforce and supplement State child-labor and school-attendance laws."

Actually, the primary objective is made clear—that of enforcing school attendance laws, because the Federal law does not prohibit children from working on a farm unless it is done where a local school happens to be in session. So there can be no question but that the whole scheme and purpose of the Senate amendment, offered by former Senator Pepper and sponsored by the Labor Department, was to turn more Federal employees loose over the country to help enforce school attendance. And that has been done despite the clear intention of the Constitution to reserve the States the matter of control of the education of their youth.

This is a good example of Federal encroachment, of pyramiding powers, of the extension of control over activities that are local in character and which can and should be handled on a local level.

Mr. Speaker, do we want to turn over to the Labor Department in Washington, by gradual extension of power, the obligation of the States to control, by indirection or otherwise, the length of attendance and the particular months in school, of all children in this country under the age of 16 years? That is the issue involved in this legislation.

With that in mind, I introduced a bill nearly a year ago to correct the mistake that was made by the Senate amendment. Other Members introduced bills on the same subject. Hearings were held, but no committee action has as yet been taken.

To illustrate the soundness and urgency of the measure which I introduced, I submit pertinent excerpts from testimony which the committee heard on the subject:

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I think the picture giving the problem of harvesting the cotton crops in West Texas by migratory laborers has been well developed by the witnesses who have testified. What has happened in the past has been that these migratory Latin-American families have been able to travel to the cotton fields to the north in the fall of the year, gather cotton during the harvest season and then return south to their homes in time to get in the required school attendance under the laws of Texas. The law there requires attendance in school for a minimum of 120 days each year, and it is a criminal offense for parents not to comply with that law by sending their children to school for the required time.

What they are able to do is come up during the rush harvest season, which will not wait. Cotton has to be harvested during the month or two of the peak, and then the pickers go back home from where they come, in order to finish out the school year. They can do that even by beginning in December and finishing by June, and still meet the State requirements on minimum attendance. They have been getting their schooling in.

What has happened is that this law, which is having such an adverse effect upon the Latin-American families and upon the harvest of the crops has been to require that while they are picking cotton there, they have to go to school. It is not economic for many of those families to stay in the fields and operate unless the children also pick. Some of them could attend school, perhaps, where there are large families, but where there is just the father and the mother, with five or six or seven or eight children, who would be affected, they cannot very well afford to stay up there and have only two of them pick.

Mr. WIER. Do you mean to say by that the father and mother, unless—I do not like to use the word "exploited," but unless they use these children in the cotton fields they cannot exist? Is that what you mean to say?

Mr. FISHER. Some of them can. Of course, some of them can, but many of them find it more economic to go back home and struggle along and get on relief and make out.

The whole economy is geared to a system which has grown up through the years whereby these migratory families are able to meet the school requirements and go out in the early fall, at the beginning of the normal school year, and make a considerable amount of money, as has been very well developed here. Then they are able to go back and buy food and clothing. Many of them

go to college and the children can get in their required schooling.

Mr. WIER. That is just what I wanted to know.

Mr. FISHER. Thereby they stay off the relief rolls and get along very well.

Mr. WIER. That is just what I cannot understand. We had one witness here who represented the tremendous amounts of money that the man and wife could make during these days of harvest. I think it was \$45 or \$50 which they made between them. Then I hear your story about the hardship that comes about.

Let me ask you this question, Mr. Boyd—

Mr. BOYD. All right, sir.

Mr. WIER. The people who live in these counties and profit as a result of these crops certainly have a responsibility for school facilities, the same as in my school district. Have you had any increase in your millage or your tax levy with which to add facilities?

Mr. BOYD. No, sir. Just the normal increase to take care of our normal conditions.

Mr. WIER. You have not had any addition to school equipment.

Mr. BOYD. Just a normal increase.

Mr. WIER. Normal?

Mr. BOYD. Yes; to take care of our normal increase. This extra excess increase; no.

Mr. MAHON. You see, they cannot build any school building or buy new buses and provide all these new facilities for just about 1 month or 6 weeks a year. If they were there the year around they would have to provide the facilities, and would get the money from the State to help them provide facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me interrupt at this point, Mr. Witness. I think I understand the situation.

They have gone one step further toward the bad situation than we have in our area. Down my way for many years the agricultural people have had to rely on the children working. It does not hurt them. I was plowing by the time I could reach the plow handles, and that is the general practice in the country, so far as that is concerned.

Our schools will begin opening in the next 15 days, right on till the 1st of September. Down where Mr. Henderson comes from which is the largest strawberry market in the world, they must get those schools open.

Mr. WIER. I heard that for 3 days one time, when we had this bill up for the strawberry business.

The CHAIRMAN. They must get those schools open in time for them to handle the crop. That is the way we handle it there, and that has been the practice for years, but the trouble with these folks is that the children come from one area where the school is closed, to take care of the situation, and they go to another area where there was no necessity for the school to operate on that schedule, and the schools are open. The result is that the south Texas-Latin Americans get their schooling down there, and then they come up and disrupt schooling and keep the kids in the cotton area from getting their schooling.

You know you cannot do anything with 75 to 90 children in a schoolroom.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, there is one more thing that should be emphasized.

I was born and reared in a cotton area, and I still live there. It is hard for some people who lived in the high-income areas of the United States to visualize the need for these children to work.

There are many families in this area you are talking about down in south Texas, and even in my area, who cannot possibly make a living without the aid of their children during these seasonal crops, period.

When we prohibited them from using those children, we were not doing a thing in the world to help these farmers, so much as we are destroying the possibility of those folks to have a reasonable living for the rest of the year.

Mr. BURLERSON. One other point, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Tackett, will you yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes.

Mr. BURLERSON. It places the burden on the farmer, also, to determine whether or not the child is of school age.

These Latin-American, and many white people, will be driven to the desperate situation, and I expect that some of the farmers have experienced it, in that the father will misrepresent the age of a child. You cannot blame them very much, because it means their bread and butter during the winter-time. It is very hard to know a Latin-American, as some of you know, by looks. It is hard to tell the age of the child.

The CHAIRMAN. When that happens does that involve the farmer? Does that make him a criminal?

Mr. BURLERSON. It would place the burden upon the farmer, if he absolutely were safe, to have a birth certificate from every one of them, telling his age.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the time is running on. Let me refer to the Texas Employment Commission report.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you gentlemen do not feel under pressure here. These people are very serious about it, and we are quite interested.

Mr. FISHER. All right.

This State commission, which is the official State agency, made a survey of the situation and of this terrific problem. You cannot imagine how serious it is getting to be. Either the cotton pickers are there at the right time, or the cotton is gone forever. This is the only way to get it out, through the migratory workers. Ninety percent of the cotton is picked by the migratory workers.

Here is what is referred to in this report, the official State report based upon an actual survey:

"A new problem was presented during the 1950 cotton harvest as a result of an amendment to the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act which permitted the enforcement of the provision establishing 16 years as the minimum age for employment in agriculture during school hours. This act affected almost 100 percent of the migratory cotton-harvest crews, since these crews customarily travel in family groups.

"Since farmers are liable under the act, they could employ only adult members of a crew and were reluctant, in many cases, to employ crews having children because of the penalty involved if the children should work."

I have another point now:

"Rather than run the risk of a fine because of underage children being used by crew leaders or family heads without their knowledge, many farmers refused to hire crews with children.

"On the other hand, many family heads stated that they could not earn sufficient money to maintain their families without the earnings of their children and refused to work unless the farmers would permit the children to work also, which, of course, the farmers could not afford to do. In these cases the workers withdrew from the cotton harvest and returned to their homes in south Texas, thus further increasing the shortage of harvest hands in the affected areas," and so forth.

Just by way of referring very briefly to how this hiatus came about, you will recall that under the old act, the law that has been in effect in the past under which we were able to operate and still meet the minimum requirements for school attendance, we were able to make out. All of the children were getting in their required time each year under the original act.

Section 13 (c) provided that "The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture while not legally

required to attend school in the place where he is employed or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures," and so forth. That was the original law. That way they were able to meet the minimum educational attendance laws in the various States and at the same time go out and do this agricultural work during the harvest season, which usually lasts 1 or 2 months, so far as cotton is concerned.

Then it will be recalled in the act of 1949 the House passed the amendment to the wage-and-hour law and left section 13 (c) like it was. There was no change made. We could get along fine under the House version. But it went over to the Senate, and an amendment was put in, and I find from a reference to the report that the Labor Department sponsored it, and they changed it to read as follows:

"Section (c) of 13: The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed," and so forth. In other words, it upset the system they had followed through the years. That amendment was offered in the Senate by Senator Claude Pepper.

The CHAIRMAN. The provision "while he is so employed, where such employee is living."

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Working during the harvest season, they have to go to school. There is no option.

Of course, they can turn out the schools and then comply with the law and work to their hearts' content. But that is not feasible and it is asking too much.

This is not a matter of controlling child labor. This is a matter of saying that they get in their required amount of schooling and at the same time permit them to work. They are permitted to work in the harvest anyway, provided they meet the minimum school attendance.

Mr. KELLEY. What was the statement you just read?

Mr. FISHER. Well, the difficulty, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], is this: *

Under the new law in the Senate amendment of 1949 they changed the wording just a little bit, which I just read.

Mr. KELLEY. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. TACKETT. Let me ask you one little question right there.

Do you not agree that even though this present law is detrimental to the farmer, who is here testifying today, that it is more detrimental to the migratory family which needs this employment?

Mr. FISHER. Absolutely. It has been shown so clearly and dramatically here today as to how these people are getting along. They are not exploited. Go down there and talk to them, and you would be ashamed to hear of this "exploiting."

These people get \$2 to \$3 a hundred for pulling or picking cotton. Families make up to \$40 or \$50 a day, where the family is permitted to work. They save up the money and they go back home and live well. They get along. They even send some of the older kids to college. They stay off the relief rolls.

Mr. WIER. Who makes the most money, the kids or the parents?

Mr. FISHER. It depends on how many kids there are.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, may I say one word?

We are talking about money here, and I am a farmer up there. I have worked with the Mexicans off and on. Us farmers up there send lots of money to south Texas, before these hands come in.

Mr. Tippen, over there, a neighbor of mine, will tell you, I am sure, that there is never

a year but what a number of families come to work for us. They write us letters in the winter, "Need \$300. I will be back to your place next summer or fall."

Practically all of us do that. These people live there in south Texas or go to school. They work the short season that they have to work, and there is lots of money out of west Texas now in south Texas, that those people have, and they will come back and pay us back quickly.

If it were not for those people we would have to close up in west Texas. If it were not for us the State and the Government would have to feed them.

The CHAIRMAN. They are the families you regard as stable and trustworthy?

Mr. BATES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And then you loan them money until they come back?

Mr. BATES. I have. I do not know how many are down there now. I will get it back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McConnell?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, while listening to this discussion I have been trying to recall the background of this entire matter. As you know, I have been probably as much connected, or more so, with the fair-labor standards legislation than any other person on the committee.

The present act, as originally written back in 1938, had the phrase, "while not legally required to attend school."

Mr. FISHER. That is right.

Mr. McCONNELL. Then when we were considering changes in 1949, I remember the Lesinski bill had the present wording of the act: "outside of school hours in the place where legally employed," and so on.

There was not a great deal of discussion, as I recall it, in the House committee, while we were considering it, but the upshot of it was that we decided to leave the act approximately as the original language was set forth.

Mr. FISHER. That is right.

Mr. McCONNELL. Then it went over to the Senate, and I notice here a report put in by Mr. Pepper, the Senator from Florida, for Senator Thomas, who was the chairman of the Senate committee. It states here:

"Under the present provisions of the act children who are employed in agriculture are exempt from the child-labor provisions while not legally required to attend school. The Wage and Hour Division has pointed out that the administration of this provision has proven to be difficult in view of variations from State to State with respect to school-attendance requirements. This has in turn resulted in inadequate protection of educational opportunities of children employed in agriculture in many States. The committee amendment would correct this situation by limiting exemption to employment in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where the child is living while so employed. This recommendation is in accordance with the recommendation of the Wage and Hour Division, which has pointed out that the school hours for many districts can readily be ascertained. As at present, the child-labor provisions would not apply to children employed by their parents on their parents' farm outside of school hours."

That language was adopted by the Senate, and I noticed the report. I attended the conference, and I still cannot recall why we agreed to the Senate provisions, but we did so. The Senate provisions were placed into the present act as the words: "outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed."

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman let me interrupt there?

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure I know why there was not some question raised about it. It was because, as is the case so often, when you are writing a law that goes into the

States of the 48 States of the Union, I did not know about this situation.

Mr. MAHON. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. There was not anyone on the conference committee who knew about it.

Mr. MAHON. The Chairman will remember that there was no separate vote in the House on the child-labor portion of the conference report, and there was no roll call on the conference report.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not know about it. That is what so often I run into, when we dig down closely.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have given this background is not only to make us more familiar with what has occurred but also to suggest that we have some representative from the Wage and Hour Division to explain more clearly their side of the problem involved.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, may I point out something?

My bill, H. R. 2796, which is to put the law back like it was word for word, would correct that.

With respect to the wage-and-hour-law question, I have read the report on my bill from the Secretary of Labor and have studied it. It will not stand too much close analysis. I do not think it would stand a very close cross-examination.

Just to illustrate how effective our present laws on school attendance can be, this is a very brief quotation. Let me read from the Texas law on that subject, article 2892 of the Revised Civil Statutes:

"Every child in the States who is 7 years and not more than 16 years of age shall be required to attend the public schools in the district of its residence or at some other district to which it may be transferred as provided by the law for a period of not less than 120 days. The period of compulsory school attendance at each school shall begin at the opening of the school term unless otherwise authorized by the district school trustees and notice given by the trustees prior to the beginning of such school term."

In other words, the school trustees excuse these migratory laborers to go up and earn their livelihood and make this money and harvest this crop. They have a record on every one of them. That record is a public record.

When they talk about the fact that it makes it difficult to know whether they are complying with the school laws or not, it does not make sense.

I understand that most States have something comparable to that. They keep a record on every single one of them. It says: "You are excused for 2 or 3 months; and you come back to go to school."

The CHAIRMAN. There is no disposition on your part, or on the part of anybody else, to object to a compulsory school law?

Mr. FISHER. No, Mr. Chairman. We believe in compulsory school attendance. We are willing for those youngsters to go to school, but we think the attendance laws will do the job. The State law is very strict, and keeps a record on every child who is excused during harvest season. They have to be excused by the trustees at the place where they live. But they eventually get in their full minimum attendance.

Mr. POTTER. Are those Latin-Americans concentrating in south Texas, so that one school district would have a majority of the Latin-Americans?

Mr. MAHON. In certain areas.

Mr. POTTER. The policy in one area would not have an adverse effect upon other students.

Mr. FISHER. That is right. Their schools are all geared for that situation, and they have been for generations.

Mr. POTTER. Are they segregated schools?

Mr. FISHER. No; they are not. However, a lot of these people come from San Antonio, and in San Antonio a lot of them naturally

live in areas populated principally by Latin-Americans.

They could easily shut down for a month or two in a school like that, for a month or two or three, and then start up in December and still get in the requirement.

Mr. MAHON. May I interrupt a moment? I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. This problem is an emergency. It is nigh onto the time when the crop will be harvested. If we cannot get a change in this law we will have havoc and waste and dislocation of schools and injury to the cause of education and agriculture, not only in west Texas, but in some other areas. I think everybody will agree with me that it is an emergency situation about which something must be done as soon as possible.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. MAHON, this does not apply only to Texas. It applies to Mississippi, Arkansas, and every place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE NORFOLK SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CORP. CAUGHT BETWEEN THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House a most unfortunate situation which is adversely affecting more than 1,200 of my constituents and their families, and which threatens to make idle, or sharply reduce the efficiency of, a highly-important defense activity in my district. I am speaking of a wage situation confronting the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. and its employees. The problem here involved seems to grow out of policies promulgated by two Government agencies in which the action or lack of action on the part of the National Labor Relations Board collides with a procedural policy established by the Wage Stabilization Board.

It may well be that these two policies do not normally conflict. It may be, generally speaking, the policies are sound. On these points, it is unnecessary for me to comment. There is, however, the inescapable observation that in this particular situation a conflict has arisen and neither of the two agencies involved will yield. It should be apparent to everyone that no matter how sound a policy may be in its general application, situations may arise which justify exceptions. The matter which I am discussing is just such a situation, and the dictates of practical common sense demand that this matter be resolved without further delay, in order to alleviate the hardship imposed upon a great number of people, and to reduce or eliminate the likelihood that this important defense activity may be unable to fulfill its obligations in this time of emergency.

I have made some study of this situation, and shall try to outline the facts as I understand them.

The name implies the nature of the work in which the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. is engaged. It is a large private establishment with normal employment ranging upward from 1,200 men. It is a busy concern, and has a

reputation for good workmanship in repairing and maintaining ships.

I have no knowledge that prior to 1944 the employees of this company were affiliated with any national labor union. On August 25, 1944, the National Labor Relations Board caused an election to be held to determine whether the employees desired to be represented by affiliation with the CIO, AFL, or by neither. There were three alternatives, and in that election, none of the three received a majority of the votes cast. As a consequence, on October 4, 1944, a run-off election was held to determine whether or not the employees wished to be represented by a CIO-affiliated union. In this election, 1,416 votes were cast, of which 33 were void, 731 voted in favor of representation by the CIO, and 652 voted against CIO affiliation. It will be seen that the CIO received a majority of the votes cast and was certified as the bargaining agent for the employees. At that time there was a total of 1,685 employees eligible to vote.

As I understand it, following that election, numerous negotiations were held between the company and CIO representatives without any contractual agreement being reached. During these negotiations there have been charges of bad faith, both on the part of the union and of the company.

I have not attempted to concern myself with the validity of these charges. I think it would be improper for me to do so. This is a matter which can be finally adjudicated by the courts only, but in view of the fact that these or similar arguments have been in progress almost continuously since the election in October 1944, and in view of the fact that during this entire time no contract between the company and the union has ever been executed, there is little hope to anticipate that an early agreement will be reached. The matter has not yet gone into the courts and when it does, there is little reason to expect prompt finality of determination. You and I know how matters of this kind can be drawn out by capable legal talent when each is convinced of the merit of his own position.

My attention was called to this matter by an employee who came to me shortly before the beginning of this session in January. He told me he had been asked by a group of his fellow workers to see whether I could help in straightening out the matters which had him and his fellow workers so upset. He said there were so many charges and countercharges that the workers did not know what to believe or to expect. He said he was a union member in good standing; that he was not mad at the union or at the company. He said further, however, that he felt that he and his fellow employees were entitled to an increase in pay rates. He said they need the increase badly; that they do not want to do anything rash, but that all of the employees of the company could secure comparable employment at higher rates elsewhere in the area and that many had done so. He told me that many key personnel had left the company because of the strain on their economic situa-

tions and he explained that the efficiency of the yard had already dropped.

I was impressed by the sincerity of this individual, by his sense of fairness and by the fact that he was seeking only justice and understanding. He told me further that many of the employees were frequently working as much as 70 or 100 hours a week in order to get out the emergency work.

It will be recalled that on June 7, 1951, the Wage Stabilization Board approved above-ceiling wage increases for employees of the major shipyards on the east coast. I had understood that similar increases at other yards were intended and that administrative personnel of the Board were empowered to grant such increases to employees of those yards not specifically covered by the June 7 action.

About this same time or shortly thereafter, there was a renewal of contract negotiations between the union and the company. These negotiations reached an impasse and on June 28, 1951, a strike was called. On July 2 the company announced its intention to increase rates, and on July 12 filed a petition with the Wage Stabilization Board for permission to increase the wages of its employees to conform to the pattern of the wages approved by the WSB for similar employment on June 7. On the date of the filing of this petition, the union terminated the strike.

On August 24, 1951, the Wage Stabilization Board advised that it would not process the petition because it failed to bear the signature of the union. Notwithstanding the fact that the union had terminated the strike on July 12, when the petition for the increases was submitted, it declined to join in the petition for the increases.

I have no knowledge concerning the reasons for the union's refusal to sign, but I am advised that it still adheres to this position. Since I began discussions with the governmental agencies I understand that the WSB has, either directly or indirectly, sought unsuccessfully to persuade the union to sign this petition.

On October 22, 1951, a Norfolk attorney was retained by 467 employees of the company for the purpose of filing with the NLRB a request for decertification of the CIO as bargaining agent for the employees. This petition for decertification obviously was an effort on the part of the employees to provide a basis whereby the wage increases could be approved by the WSB under its spolicy. No action was taken on this request until January 7, 1952, when the NLRB addressed a communication to the attorney for these 467 employees requesting withdrawal of the petition for decertification of the CIO. That letter indicated that court action was pending against the company, that the NLRB had a policy against acting on such petitions during or pending court action and that unless the request was withdrawn, the Board would dismiss the petition by formal action. In keeping with this communication, the employees withdrew the petition.

Briefly summarized, the facts are these. A CIO affiliate was certified as bargaining agent for the employees of the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.

in October 1944. Since that time there have been numerous negotiations, but no contract has ever been executed between the company and the union. The WSB on June 7, 1951, provided for over-ceiling increases in wages for personnel in east coast shipyards. The union called a strike in the company's plants on June 28, 1951. The company filed with the WSB a request for wage increases to its employees on July 12. At that time the union called off the strike. The WSB refused to process the petition for wage increases because the union did not sign it. The union still refuses to sign it.

The employees are legally entitled to higher wages. The company wants to pay the higher wages. It wants to pay the higher wages retroactively to July 2. It cannot pay the higher wages because the WSB will not even process its application. The WSB will not consider the application because it has a procedural policy to require that the petitions for such increases be signed jointly by the company and the union. A large number of employees requested that the union be decertified as bargaining agent. The NLRB refuses to decertify because court action is pending.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is silly. It amazes me that there is so little practical common sense in the agencies that a means has not been found to overcome the policy obstacles. I do not know who is right in the arguments between the company and the union, but I do know that more than 1,200 employees and their families are undergoing hardships because of this impasse. I know also that there is much unrest among these employees and that their efficiency has already been lowered. I can also understand their confusion, and why many valuable employees have left the company. Because of the current situation there is imminent and continuing likelihood of work stoppage. Under existing emergency conditions this would be deplorable.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about this. I have tried as best I could through urging the Wage Stabilization Board and the NLRB to find a solution. At my suggestion, the legal talent of these two agencies did get together to discuss it. That is all they did—discuss it. I have talked to Chairman Feinsinger of the Wage Stabilization Board and Chairman Herzog of the National Labor Relations Board. They both recognize that something should be done, but, Mr. Speaker, they have not done anything. I have also sought to enlist the assistance of Mr. Wilson's office.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the trouble is, but when the legal talent in these two agencies get together and do not find a solution, then I am sadly disillusioned. I am forced to the conclusion that they are either incompetent or just plain bullheaded. The situation is urgent. It needs to have attention.

The CIO may have what it considers good and sufficient reasons for declining to sign this petition. However, I cannot believe it is opposed to an increase in pay for its members. More than 1,200 men and their families are the innocent victims of this WSB policy. It is passing strange how sometimes men become

obsessed with a notion that their decisions are sacred and unchangeable. It is sad that a little authority gives some men a conviction of infallibility. A man who cannot adjust himself to new facts and change his procedural rules to conform to practical requirements is unfit to serve on any board of authority in our Republic.

These employees should not be made to suffer longer. The Nation needs the services performed by this company. If this important shipyard is closed down before the litigation has ended, the responsibility will rest squarely upon one or the other of the two agencies involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, and an editorial appearing in the Lowell Sun.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in this week's Saturday Evening Post there appears an editorial entitled "Widows of Servicemen Could Have Better Deal." I am asking that it be made a part of these remarks, in order that the Members of Congress may read it.

It is extremely doubtful that there is a Representative or Senator who has not received many letters from widows of servicemen who have been killed or died during active service, telling of the desperate straits in which they have been placed because of the loss of the breadwinner of the family. In these days of inflationary prices, when even a modest visit to the grocery or market means the expenditure of \$15 or \$20, the monthly pension of \$75 is a pittance and is but a small part of what is necessary for normal living. In the case of the higher ranking officers' families the situation is made more desperate owing to the fact that while the officer was alive and receiving the pay commensurate with his grade his family grew accustomed to a standard of living far beyond the level of the \$75 a month to which it was reduced by his passing. Many of these families have succeeded in making the obligatory readjustment in their standards of living, sometimes with the help of relatives and friends. Others have not, and cannot, and their plight is desperate.

The Kilday bill, mentioned in the editorial, would not help these cases, unfortunately. What is needed, and needed desperately, is a revision upward in all pensions, whether for the family of a major general or of a private.

So many of the letters I receive from these widows ask—and rightfully so—why cannot this great country afford to take care of the families of men who gave their lives during wartime, when they can find the time and the money to rehabilitate the enemies against whom their loved ones died fighting. It is a question that is most difficult to answer. I, for one, do not know what to say in reply to such a question. The only

thing I can tell them is that I shall use every influence in my power to see that these pitifully small pensions are increased.

The editorial follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of February 16, 1952]

WIDOWS OF SERVICEMEN COULD HAVE BETTER DEAL

The widow of an American major general who was killed in action in 1943 receives from a grateful Nation about \$75 a month, or \$900 a year, plus a small allowance for her children until they reach the age of 21. If her late husband had managed to stay alive, possibly by sticking around the command post instead of nosing into matters up front, his pension would amount to about \$8,000 a year and he would also be available for a vice presidency in National Ceramics or Amalgamated Plastics at maybe \$75,000 a year in addition. A case in point is that of the late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, who died in the service of his country. His widow will receive benefits of about \$75 a month. What happens to the survivors of American soldiers is not fit to be chronicled among America's greater glories.

Furthermore, the surviving veteran officer is able to buy his groceries at commissaries, if he lives near one, thereby stretching his pension further than it would go at current retail prices. But the widow of his deceased classmate, struggling along on \$75 a month plus the proceeds of her husband's \$10,000 insurance policy, if he had one, enjoys no such privilege. She must buy at the ordinary stores. It is not surprising that some officers' wives feel the way the wife of the hero of John P. Marquand's novel Melville Goodwin, U. S. A. felt—namely, stick close to the Pentagon and get a staff job.

A bill was introduced in the House last session by Representative PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas, to correct these inequities for widows of servicemen killed in the future. But, because the Kilday bill proposes a contributory insurance plan, no relief is in the cards for widows of men who died in World War II or in the Korean "police action." The Kilday bill would provide annuities, for widows, of 25 percent of the husband's annual base pay, plus an allowance for dependent children up to the age of 18. This represents a substantial improvement in the lot of widows of men who died while serving in the higher ranks. The national conscience might be more eased, however, if something were done to better the lot of today's service widows and their families. Congress should at least explore the possibility of providing benefits for them, similar to those urged by Representative KILDAY for future widows.

I am attending a dinner tonight of the Hoover Committee. They have done a fine piece of work, and we have economized a great deal in many directions. I personally have voted for many of the Commissioners' recommendations. The Congress has economized in many ways, and should do more. I would like to say that many of the report suggestions regarding the cuts in veterans' benefits are unwise and unfair. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold hearings on recommendations of the Hoover Committee. I doubt very much however if the Hoover Commission has any realization of what would happen if all of them went into effect. I am constantly seeing the results of cuts in personnel in the Veterans' Administration—unfair cuts as a matter of fact because they are playing favorites and retaining some people and promoting others and cutting still others. So far as the cutting of

beds in the hospitals is concerned, it is an outrageous thing. I think the consolidation of the hospitals is very unwise. I am told that the employees at the Framingham hospital were promised to be transferred to the hospital at West Roxbury when the Framingham hospital was closed, but they are now being told that they will not be sent there, or that they will have to take cuts. There are 159 paraplegics who will have to be moved either to the Jamaica Plain hospital or the West Roxbury hospital. They will have no place to go out of doors. Those hospitals are totally unsuited for the care of paraplegics. There are no grounds surrounding these hospitals. Something must be done, Mr. Speaker, to see that the necessary number of beds are provided in veterans' hospitals. In many communities there are tremendous shortages of beds even for service-connected cases. There have been suicides as a result of the shortage of beds because the very sick mental patients could not be hospitalized. In my opinion, I believe there may be more suicides. The whole program has been ill-considered, and ill-thought out. I think the Army is taking over installations which should be left with the Veterans' Administration. I think the armed services will rue the day that they take away these beds from the veterans. There is one thing, and the first thing we owe these veterans, and that is to give them the chance to get well and to live. We must do it, Mr. Speaker.

The following is an editorial from the Lowell Sun of February 16, 1952:

THE TWO "E's"

Efficiency and economy are two of the greatest assets any form of government may have. Administration and management are considered above par when both of these estimable results are achieved through careful, intelligent, and productive direction.

The Federal Government in the past generation has been notoriously lax on both counts. During the depression years, the sad state of Federal economic affairs was readily attributed by the administration to conditions beyond control; during the war years the emergency was so great that no one was so unpatriotic as to give too much attention to Federal balance sheets.

Since the end of the war there has been no improvement. The old order still persists, with gross corruption thrown in to make matters worse.

Because of this unhealthy condition, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has found millions of disciples in all parts of the country; men and women who are anxious to see the Government put back on an operating basis that will at least suggest that those in charge are doing their best to achieve economy and efficiency. These people are weary of the defiant and blustering attitude of the administration when excessive Federal expenditures are discussed.

In spite of considerable resistance, however, from official sources, some of the recommended economies of the Hoover report have been instituted, but there are still many recommendations which have either been sidetracked or rejected.

The Citizens Committee would have been out of existence last December if it had not been persuaded by the public to remain at its task until greater results were achieved.

Hence, next Monday in Washington the Citizens Committee, now almost 3 years old, is going to hold a convention to consider the phases of the report which have not been

considered or acted upon. The committee will launch a final drive to induce Congress and the President to enact as soon as possible the remaining recommendations.

In anticipation of this meeting which has already aroused great interest from coast to coast, Dr. Robert Johnson, chairman of the committee, has this to say:

"At no time in our history has the American public been face to face so dramatically with the need for sweeping reforms within our Government. Within recent weeks the Nation has received shock after shock at disclosures concerning the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Senate for more than 2 years had sat on Hoover Commission bills for taking internal revenue collectors and collectors of customs out of politics.

"Take the Post Office Department as another source of scandals. In Mississippi, persons had been convicted of selling postal appointments. Investigations are in progress in Michigan to determine whether or not political contributions are prerequisite for postal appointments, and in Massachusetts postal employees are under indictment for putting on the payroll hundreds of persons who had no duties to perform.

"We will meet in Washington on this occasion in an atmosphere of widespread public recognition of the dangers of enormous Government waste, duplication, overlapping, nonessential spending, and even corruption."

There, in not too many words, is the reason for the existence of this citizens committee. It is trying to serve as a watchdog to prevent more scandalous and extravagant actions within the higher echelons in the Federal Service.

It is for the best interests of all Americans, including the President and all aspirants for the Presidency, if Congress will put through most of the remaining recommendations of the Hoover report just as quickly as possible. The margin for corruption which is now too temptingly apparent in so many Federal divisions would be reduced to almost a negligible degree if these recommendations are adopted, and the repulsive and repeated discoveries of thieves and grafters within the Federal upper brackets could be reduced to such a point that the latent fear which is now ever-present in the mind of every thoughtful American would be washed away.

Naturally, the ugly stories of what has been going on in Washington in recent years will be unveiled during the pending election campaigns. There is no escape, and it is actually a good thing for the Nation as a whole to have these facts brought out in the open so that they will serve to compel remedies.

In keeping with the way a democracy is operated, therefore, the people of the country have two avenues of escape from the black record of public service in Washington in the past few years. They may urge additional adoption of the Hoover report recommendations, which cannot fail to bring about considerable correction, and they can also thoughtfully consider what has been going on when they go to the polling booth to choose their highest executive officers next fall.

Before 1952 ends, much may be accomplished to restore to our Federal service a note of reliability, honesty, efficiency, economy, and sincerity.

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., February 6, 1952.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am enclosing herewith a report to Department Commander Timothy J. Murphy from our service office

which relates to the proposed closing of the Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital in Framingham around July 1, 1952.

The members of the Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars are deeply concerned as to the question of what will become of the tubercular and paraplegic patients now at Cushing as noted in paragraph 6 which I have marked for your attention.

It is well to state that all patients will be taken care of, but the big question is when and how, especially if any delays occur in opening up the new Veterans' Administration hospital in Jamaica Plain and where will the proper facilities be for paraplegics.

Deeply grateful for your many past favors, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. POWERS,
Quartermaster-Adjutant.

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
SERVICE BUREAU,
Boston, Mass., January 29, 1952.

MR. TIMOTHY J. MURPHY,
Commander, Department of Massachusetts, VFW, Boston, Mass.

DEAR COMRADE COMMANDER: The following is a report of a meeting held with Dr. Francis Carroll at 17 Court Street, Boston. Represented at the meeting were Disabled American Veterans, Italian American War Veterans, Spanish American War Veterans, Amvets, Marine Corps League, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Comrade Timothy O'Neill of the disabled American veterans presided. The opening remarks of the meeting were made by Comrade O'Neill in which he drew the attention of Dr. Carroll to remarks previously made by him at which time he stated that he would attempt to assist the Veterans' organizations in maintaining the Cushing Veterans Administration Hospital for veteran patients.

Dr. Carroll explained that this was his purpose. However, he was overruled by General Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans Affairs and Admiral Boone, Chief of Medical Facilities for the Veterans Administration. At a meeting held between Dr. Carroll, General Gray, and Admiral Boone, Dr. Carroll was informed that it would be impossible to keep open the Cushing Veterans Administration hospital after a tentative date, July 1, 1952. General Gray and Admiral Boone stated at that time that the defense department had received priority on this property and would take over regardless of any opposition confronting them. It was, therefore, necessary for Admiral Boone to announce the closing of Cushing Veterans Administration hospital at a dinner recently tendered him by the Jewish War Veterans. Dr. Carroll further stated at this meeting that the tentative date for closing Cushing would be July 1, 1952, and the new Veterans Administration Hospital in Jamaica Plain to be opened tentatively, July 1, 1952. He wishes us to convey to our members that this date cannot be counted upon due to the fact that he will make certain that no veteran patient will be transferred from the Cushing Veterans Administration Hospital until adequate facilities are available.

Dr. Carroll's main concern in the transfer of patients was the paraplegic veteran. Although he did not actually state in words it was felt by those present that he directed his remarks about the paraplegic veterans based on the fact that he wishes to avoid a repetition of a scandal created some time ago in California when the paraplegic patients in that State were moved to another area, creating great hardships on them. He stated that as medical director of this region he will make certain that no paraplegic veteran is removed from Cushing Veterans' Ad-

ministration Hospital until a building is erected for them somewhere else in this Commonwealth.

He has plans in mind to erect a building in addition to the existing hospital at West Roxbury, principally for paraplegic patients. He has requested through central office that a commission be sent to this area to study the site at West Roxbury for the erection of this proposed building to house the paraplegic patients. This commission will report to him in the very near future as to the advisability of constructing such a building on the grounds at West Roxbury hospital. They will further report construction costs and all pertinent data relative to any construction that may take place. Dr. Carroll has promised the commanders conference that he will not allow this commission to return to central office until he is fully satisfied that the paraplegic patients at Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital will be taken care of.

A question was brought out by a commander present at the meeting as to what would be done with the other general medical, surgical, tubercular, and neuropsychiatric cases now confined to Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital when it is closed. He stated that these patients can be transferred when facilities are available to the new hospital in Jamaica Plain. However, the hospital in Jamaica Plain cannot house paraplegic patients and also does not have facilities available at the present time in the construction plans to treat tubercular patients. Dr. Carroll was asked the question what would become of the tubercular patients now housed at Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital. He stated that he did not have the answer and the only thing that he could state was that the new hospital in Jamaica Plain cannot treat tubercular patients.

He further stated that the Army will take over at some date the Cushing Veterans' Administration hospital and will not accept a Veterans' Administration patient for treatment purposes although the Defense Department does allow the United States Army to transfer their patients to Veterans' Administration hospital facilities for treatment. In my opinion this would create a great hardship upon veterans now awaiting hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration.

Dr. Carroll was sympathetic in his statements to the commanders conference and wished to convey to all that although he personally wished the Veterans' Administration hospital at Framingham be kept open, he was overruled by higher authority.

In the opinion of Dr. Carroll, he feels that nothing can be done to prevent the Defense Department from taking over the Cushing Veterans' Administration hospital and when asked for his advice as to how we should proceed from here on in, he understandably answered with, "No comment."

It is felt by this writer that Dr. Carroll has done all that he personally could in keeping open the Cushing Veterans' Administration hospital and only congressional action can prevent its closing.

In closing, I wish to bring out one important statement made by Dr. Carroll in which he brought out that if permission was granted by Central Office to erect additional facilities for the treatment of paraplegic patients at West Roxbury that it would take approximately 1 year from the date of breaking ground before this building could be erected and that no paraplegic patient will be transferred until these proposed facilities are available.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD S. GILMARTIN,
Service Officer.

P. S.—Newington will be made into a domiciliary.

NORWOOD, MASS., February 21, 1952.
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am enclosing a letter which is being sent out by the employees of Cushing VA hospital, to Congressmen in their districts, and also a photostat of the newspaper clipping referred to in this letter, in which General Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, informed you last March 12 of the plans for the closing of Cushing VA Hospital.

Admiral Joel T. Boone, VA medical director, recently announced that these plans were to be carried out with the opening of the new Boston VA hospital.

Needless to say, the employees at this hospital are extremely upset, after giving 5 years of devoted, loyal service, to be pushed aside and not considered for positions at the Boston hospital.

As the enclosed clipping indicates, General Gray assured you that when the closing of Cushing Hospital came about, its staff would be transferred to Boston.

We are asking you to intervene on our behalf to see that this promise is kept, as it means a lot to the employees' welfare. Would it be asking too much, in addition to your intervening for us in this matter, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this attached letter from the Cushing employees, and also the substance of the clipping, also attached?

I would like to request that you do not disclose my name when submitting this letter from the employees, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I know you will appreciate that with the turmoil going on, and my position as an employee here, it would be harmful.

May I congratulate you on the fine work which you have done in your aid and assistance to hospitalized and disabled veterans. I know it has been a very difficult road, but in spite of the many obstacles you have had to overcome, the job has been magnificent.

Sincerely yours,

FEBRUARY 11, 1952.

As an employee at Cushing VA hospital, I would like to comment on a newspaper article which appeared in the New York Times and was reprinted in the Lowell Sun under Washington, D. C., date line on March 12, 1951, giving advance information on the closing of Cushing VA hospital upon the completion of the new Boston VA hospital.

To quote in part from the article: "Washington, March 12.—Cushing General Hospital, Framingham, will be closed when the new Veterans' Administration hospital in Boston is completed and in operation, VA Chief Carl R. Gray advised Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Lowell, today. Administrator Gray assured Representative ROGERS the Cushing hospital will remain open until that time and indicated that its staff will be transferred to Boston when the latter facility opens."

In view of this newspaper dispatch as quoted in part, this policy is not being carried out by those Government officials in the VA central office, under the leadership of Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr. The first appointment to the Boston hospital, the chief of the supply division, was not an employee from Cushing VA Hospital, but a nonveteran from Boston regional office. Other trends indicate obligations have already been made by various responsible officials in VA central office to other than Cushing VA Hospital personnel for key positions in the new Boston hospital.

Cushing VA Hospital has been under the operation of the Veterans' Administration since October 1946, and the record it has made has been phenomenal. Its manager,

Dr. R. R. Gasser, is an outstanding administrator, with a record of highest integrity, honesty, and administering of the best standards of medical practice. There is no better proof than to examine the records as they stand. He has proven that he has the necessary ability to administer a comparable operation, such as the new Boston hospital, and this opportunity should be given him and his staff of employees.

Present appointments and obligations which are being made other than from Cushing VA Hospital staff are causing a great deal of unrest and insecurity among these career Government employees. They have become well aware that the only thing they face with these continued appointments other than from Cushing VA hospital will be lowering of grades, reduction in force, or dismissal.

There is no doubt that such practices as these in the handling of employees can create unfaithfulness and disunity among Government career employees. Faithful employees have always felt that it is a moral obligation on the part of good government to carry out commitments such as the one in the article quoted. Therefore, I am writing you and requesting that you use every bit of influence possible to see that these commitments are kept for the appointment of the manager and his staff at Cushing VA Hospital, giving them first rights of employment at the new Boston VA hospital.

Confidently yours,

CUSHING EMPLOYEES,

Cushing VA Hospital, Framingham, Mass.

VA WILL CLOSE FRAMINGHAM VETERANS' HOSPITAL—CUSHING GENERAL TO BE ABANDONED WHEN BOSTON UNIT OPENS

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Cushing General Hospital, Framingham, will be closed when the new Veterans' Administration hospital, in Boston is completed and in operation, VA Chief Carl R. Gray advised Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Lowell, today.

Administrator Gray assured Representative ROGERS the Cushing hospital will remain open until that time and indicated that its staff will be transferred to Boston when the latter facility opens.

Administrator Gray also stated, in a letter to the Lowell Republican, that the VA feels it has adequate facilities to serve domiciliary patients in the New England area. Representative ROGERS is sponsoring a bill to authorize the building of a soldiers home in Massachusetts.

Mr. Gray pointed out that the VA has no authority to exceed its present ceiling of 131,000 beds. He expressed the view that the VA's hospital at Bath, N. Y., is adequately equipped to take care of domiciliary patients in the Northeast.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
Boston, February 7, 1952.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, is very much concerned with the reductions in force that have taken place in the Veterans Employment Service due to budget cuts by recent session of Congress.

The Veterans Employment Service, a division of the Department of Labor, is charged with the supervision of the employment of veterans, especially disabled veterans, and has been trained over a period of years to effectively handle this important rehabilitation job. Their efforts for the past couple of years have been focused on the disabled veterans and despite the fact that employment in the country is high, there are still hundreds of disabled veterans seeking assistance in finding employment in Massachu-

setts. Among this group are many amputees and those with serious disabilities that require much more time and specialized effort to place than the able-bodied veteran.

We of the American Legion view these reductions in force as shameful and a repudiation of the pledge made during the fighting, that every assistance would be provided for the economic rehabilitation of those injured in battle.

The Department of Massachusetts at its convention in 1951 in Holyoke, Mass., discussed the reductions that had taken place over the past few years and passed a resolution asking Congress to provide adequate funds to maintain this important agency. At the national convention in Miami last year the convention unanimously passed a similar resolution, copy of which is enclosed.

Hearings are now being held on the budget of the Department of Labor by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, whose chairman is Representative FOGARTY of Rhode Island.

We urge you to do all in your power to assure that this service will not have to further reduce its small force, thereby denying the needed assistance to the severely disabled—to acquire that last phase of rehabilitation—employment.

Very truly yours,

J. LEO ASH,
Department Commander,
COLEMAN C. CURRAN,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION 404

Whereas it is the established policy of the Federal Government to assume responsibility for the rehabilitation and welfare of its veterans; and

Whereas all competent authorities agree that no rehabilitation is complete without establishment in gainful employment; and

Whereas because of the changing economic pattern, employment in any one area is not and never will be a stable condition but transcends local and State boundaries; and

Whereas serious difficulties are being encountered in the placement of disabled veterans and older veterans in the change-over in industry from nondefense work to defense work; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States tends to economize on all appropriations for veterans' service at a time when such services are needed, not only for the veterans of World War I and World War II, but for the veterans of the Korean campaign, who will be returning to civilian life in ever-increasing numbers the latter part of 1951 and in 1952; and

Whereas the Veterans' Employment Service has been subject in the intervening years to repeated efforts to reduce the personnel by cutting the appropriations for the service and thereby eliminating the procuring of job opportunities for veterans, especially disabled veterans; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at Miami, Fla., October 15-18, 1951, recommends that Congress appropriate adequate funds so that the Veterans' Employment Service can make continuous progress in the development of its service to veterans and disabled veterans in the field of gainful employment, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the Congress.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., February 14, 1952.
Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The Veterans of Foreign Wars, at its fifty-second national encampment, held in New York City, August 26-31, 1951, adopted resolution No. 148, a

copy of which is enclosed for your information.

We are also enclosing suggested draft of a bill which we believe is proper and sufficient to give legislative effect to this resolution. I shall appreciate it if you will please introduce this bill on our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,

Director.

RESOLUTION 148. INCREASE NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION FOR WIDOWS

Whereas the cost of living and other necessities of life are at an all-time-high level, widows and dependents of World War I and II in receipt of non-service-connected death pension find same insufficient to carry them through: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the fifty-second annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we recommend legislation to increase rate of non-service-connected pension for widows from \$42 to \$60 a month, with proportional increase for dependent children.

Approved by the fifty-second annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, New York City, August 26-31, 1951.

Submitted by Department of Montana to committee on rehabilitation and welfare service.

A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to certain dependents of deceased veterans of World War I, World War II, and of service on or after June 27, 1950

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1281), as amended (38 U. S. C. 504), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The monthly rates of pension shall be as follows: Widow but no child, \$60; widow and one child, \$75 (with \$8.50 for each additional child); no widow but one child, \$30; no widow but two children, \$45 (equally divided); no widow but three children, \$60 (equally divided), with \$6.50 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided)."

Sec. 2. The rates provided by this act shall be effective the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LITHUANIA'S FOURTH OF JULY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was the first of the little democratic nations to disappear behind the iron curtain. It is now a police state and its people suffer from mass deportations, night arrests, phoney trials, and speedy executions.

To liberty-loving Lithuanians February 16 is a day always to be remembered. It is their independence day, their fourth of July. It was on that date 34 years ago that their country became free and independent—a status to be enjoyed for only 20 years. Now again it is a subject nation—a Russian satellite.

During the happy days between World Wars I and II, when Lithuania was free, its government was wont on every February 16 to give its citizenry and all the world a balance sheet showing the progress of its people in modernizing its economy and improving their lot. Those were the days when Lithuania was known as the land of crosses. While the wood and metal crosses are fewer now,

the crosses in the hearts and minds of this brave people cannot be counted.

I addressed a gathering of 400 members of a Lithuanian-American organization in my home city of Paterson, N. J., yesterday. I was given a most beautiful book describing in words and pictures the remarkable growth of Lithuania during the free years. It was the gift of Anthony Masionis, a displaced person, who once taught in a Lithuanian university.

I told my audience there were hopeful signs, the most important being the belated awareness by Americans of the Communist threat. We know now that the United States of America is the main target. Then, too, we are receiving reports that the bold and brave Lithuanian underground is worrying the Soviets as they have never been worried before. Our Senate is preparing to ratify the Genocide Convention pact, and during the last few days approximately 30 speeches have been made on the floor of the House and Senate, all giving assurance to Lithuania we in America have not forgotten their terrible ordeal and their desire to be free.

Action is now supplanting lip service. There is real cause for encouragement.

LABOR AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the progress of labor in the United States toward the right of collective bargaining and its emancipation from court domination of past years through the use of the injunction has been a hard and painful journey. The period of exploitation of human beings is well known to labor and to all thinking Americans.

During the past 20 years under Democratic administrations labor has made its greatest progress. It is well for labor to remember this.

There is just as much need for labor to be watchful and to be on its guard today to protect the progress made as it was when labor fought long and hard to obtain its present gains.

There are powerful forces in the country today who are trying to turn back the pages of the past 20 years and to again subject labor in America to the conditions that existed prior to 1932.

Labor I repeat, should be "on its guard."

Labor should, as I am confident it will, remember its friends.

The Democratic Party is the stalwart friend of labor.

The great majority of the Democrats have clearly shown this throughout the years. This cannot be said of the other political party.

As an illustration of the organized forces existing hostile to labor and its best interest, on February 12, 1952, a National Industrial Relations Conference sponsored by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Cham-

ber of Commerce at Pittsburgh, took place in Pittsburgh, Pa. One of the principal speakers at this conference was the labor-relations adviser to the west coast shipping interests. Showing the tenor of his remarks, the headline of the New York Times of February 13 termed it "Get-tough policy urged on industry." The get-tough policy was in relation to labor. For example, the speaker suggested that a few unsuccessful strikes would temper labor's demands.

As we analyze these remarks, we understand the significance of same. Without regard to the justice of a particular dispute in the industrial field, the person who made these remarks was urging management to refuse to negotiate or approach negotiations in good faith; to impugn the motives of representatives of labor; to force some strikes; to use the economic power possessed to force a strike and to call a strike, thereby bringing about a series of such strikes for the purpose of forcing and throwing labor back again to the subservient and defenseless position it occupied not so many years ago.

This speech, made to a conference held in Pittsburgh, which was attended by 300 spokesmen of industry, is a warning to labor. It should be evidence to labor as to the future efforts by those who oppose the progress made by labor, both organized and unorganized, under the Democratic Party.

Without regard to some of the disappointments of labor but viewing the whole picture of the past 20 years and comparing that picture with the years from March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1933, when the Republican Party was in control of the Federal Government, the best interest of labor, both organized and unorganized, calls for the continuance of the Democratic Party in control of the Federal Government and of the Congress in the years that lie ahead.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HART (at the request of Mr. HOWELL), for 2 days on account of illness.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 1 week on account of death in the family.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, for 2 days, Tuesday and Wednesday, on account of necessary absence from the city.

Mr. ENGLE, for the week of February 18, on account of official business.

THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today marked the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Yalta Pact, an

agreement which has had a lot to do with the present tragedy of the Polish people. While it may be claimed by some that our country's participation in it was well-intentioned, subsequent events have resulted in a rather disheartening and disillusioning situation.

The concessions made at the time to Communist Russia enabled Stalin and his evil followers to enslave millions of people of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia. As one of the results many of the Polish people have lost all hope for freedom and independence and we are now faced with a heavy moral responsibility to formulate some effective policy tending to the liberation of Poland and the other enslaved nations now dominated by Russian Communist imperialism.

It has often been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to native ideals. If this be true, the Polish people are without peer, for they have resisted the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds. They have established a record of achievement and moral courage which is a shining example to the people of all nations.

Poland's contribution to the success of the Allied Nations during World War II and the fight of her brave people to preserve western civilization as they had on several previous occasions make it incumbent upon us to keep faith with them at this time when their long-cherished freedom is once again in chains. If we are to have a lasting peace, it must of necessity rest upon a solid foundation of justice. Such justice demands that we build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and freedom of worship are adhered to by all the nations of the world. I trust the day is not far distant when the Yalta agreement is declared invalid.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the First Iowa District and the State of Iowa are exceedingly proud of the outstanding achievement of Miss Mara Gay Masselink, a 15-year-old high school girl of Burlington, Iowa, who is one of the four winners of the Voice of Democracy contest conducted annually among the high school students of the Nation under the sponsorship of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Radio and Television Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, with the endorsement of the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. I congratulate and commend the winners and the sponsors of this outstanding event.

I have just had luncheon with the winners in the Voice of Democracy con-

test. Their visit in Washington is one of the outstanding events of my own service in Congress. They are here now as guests of their hosts who are the sponsors of this contest in which more than a million young people competed. I have had a grand visit also with Miss Masselink's father and mother, Rev. and Mrs. B. H. Masselink, and her brother Gerrit, of Burlington, Iowa. The Masselink family is a truly outstanding family worthy of the honor and recognition won by Mara Gay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a news release of February 8, announcing the results of this year's Voice of Democracy Contest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hays of Arkansas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I congratulate and commend the four winners and the sponsors of this outstanding event.

[News release of the Voice of Democracy]

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8.—Four young high-school students from Colorado, Iowa, Louisiana, and New York have been selected as the four coequal winners of the fifth annual Voice of Democracy contest.

The selections of the national judges were announced today by Robert K. Richards, chairman of the National Voice of Democracy Committee, and director of public affairs for the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, which annually co-sponsors the broadcast competition with the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. It is endorsed by the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. Associate Justice Tom C. Clark, of the United States Supreme Court, is serving again as honorary national chairman.

The four winners from a field of over 1,000,000 contestants throughout the United States are: Dwight Clark, Jr., 18, Fort Collins High School senior, Fort Collins, Colo.; Mara Gay Masselink, 15, Burlington High School junior, Burlington, Iowa; George A. Frilot, III, 17, Jesuits High School senior, New Orleans, La.; Thaddeus S. Zolkiewicz, 17, Canisius High School senior, Buffalo, N. Y.

The radio stations sponsoring the winners are: KCOL, Fort Collins, Colo., Ellis Atteberry, general manager; KBUR, Burlington, Iowa; G. M. McDermott, president-general manager; WWL, New Orleans, La., W. H. Summerville, general manager; and WBEN, Buffalo, N. Y., C. Robert Thompson, general manager.

The winners, who wrote and voiced the best 5-minute broadcast scripts on the subject, I Speak for Democracy, today are looking forward to a trip to Washington, D. C., for Awards Week. They are being brought to the Nation's capital by the sponsors, and while in Washington will meet the President of the United States, Members of Congress and the Supreme Court and other high Government and military leaders and visit the historic points of interest. At the annual awards luncheon on Washington's Birthday, Friday, February 22, at the Statler Hotel, each will receive a \$500 college scholarship, their choice of radio or television receivers, and other prizes. Dr. Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, will preside at the awards luncheon and the scholarships will be presented to the students by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine.

The youngsters will also broadcast to the youth of the world over radio-television networks and the Voice of America.

The winners, scheduled to arrive in Washington on Thursday, February 14, will be taken to Williamsburg, Va., the cradle of democracy, for the week end of February 15-18 as honored guests of John D. Rockefeller III, and the Williamsburg Foundation. While there they will participate in appropriate ceremonies commemorating the founding of our democratic Government.

The panel of outstanding Americans who judged the finalists and selected the national winners was comprised of: Joseph B. Chaplin, president, National Association of Secondary School Principals; Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; the Right Reverend Angus Dun, bishop, Episcopal diocese of Washington, D. C.; Harold E. Fellows, president, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; Senator James W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; Miss Jan Geister, winner 1947-48 Voice of Democracy Contest; Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Seymour N. Siegel, president, National Association of Educational Broadcasters; Senator Smith; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; Glen McDaniel, president, Radio-Television Manufacturers Association.

This panel, like those at the State and regional levels, judged the winners by means of transcriptions identified only by code number so that the judges did not know the identity of the contestants.

The 1951-52 Voice of Democracy Contest opened last October in conjunction with National Radio and Television Week. Tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-grade students of approximately 30,000 public, private and parochial schools across the Nation and in the Territories first listened to model addresses delivered by eminent Americans and broadcast over the Nation's radio stations. Then each contestant wrote his own 5-minute broadcast script. School and community eliminations followed, and State winners were determined from the transcriptions of the community winners.

Broadcasters, radio-television distributors, and dealers and United States Junior Chamber of Commerce chapters throughout the United States cooperated to arrange for the contests and prizes in the schools, communities, and States. The transcriptions of the State and Territorial winners were sent to national contest headquarters in Washington, D. C., where the National VOD Committee auditioned them to select the 12 finalists.

The finalists' transcriptions were then delivered to the national judges for the selection of the four winners.

The selection of the New Orleans winner in the final four marks the second consecutive year in which Louisiana has been represented by a national winner. Colorado this year also produced its second national winner since the origination of the competition. The State had a winner in the 1949-50 contest.

Described by United States Commissioner of Education McGrath as the contest for high schools, the 1951-52 Voice of Democracy contest has been one of the most successful since the competition started. The first Voice of Democracy contest in 1947-48 attracted some 30,000 students from 28 States. This year, for the second time in a row, the entries soared to more than a million from throughout the country and its possessions.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND COST ACCOUNTING

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in June 1949, as a member of the Office of the Chief, Army Field Forces, stationed at Fort Monroe, Va., I had the happy mission of lecturing to 5 out of 6 of our Army headquarters, on supply economy: The need of giving our taxpayers the most defense for their dollars.

The other day, a friend who worked with me on that series of lectures, sent me a letter stating what he thought was a deficiency in the efficient operation of the Armed Forces. I phoned his observations to the office of the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Pace, and received, in reply, a letter which I would like to make a part of the RECORD at this time. It shows an adroit use by the Department of the Army of superior management cost techniques. I trust it will help give the taxpayer more for his defense dollar.

Secretary Pace's letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1952.

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AL: My secretary gave me your telephone message of 24 January concerning a suggestion received from a friend of yours in the Army. It is gratifying to have this additional instance of an Army man looking at the activity in which he is engaged from the standpoints of cost and efficiency. The substance of his suggestion, and more, we have been in the process of implementing since I came to the Department.

Our former budget system was converted at the beginning of the current fiscal year to a performance basis. As you know, this is based on cost accounting which will disclose the accrued costs of operations and inventory values as well as the sources of funds and other resources available for the operation of each installation. A pilot model of this system is under test at Fort Knox, Ky. Additional tests are in progress at New Orleans port of embarkation and Third Army headquarters, where methods of integrating disbursing and accounting operations for the achievement of economy and greater efficiency are being developed. Our budget for fiscal year 1953 has been developed on the basis of estimates by major commands throughout the United States and overseas areas. We have compiled supplementary data showing by individual installation the detailed operating costs of each activity—right down to the number and grade of personnel employed in order to ascertain the "installation" cost of carrying out the Army's mission. In Army-operated manufacturing activities, Army industrial fund projects are being installed this year. In this type of operation working capital is fixed, and since costs of operation must be recovered from the sales of product to the using branches of the Army, the costs of items produced are of primary concern to management. These new systems, I believe, will accomplish exactly what your friend had in mind.

Another project has been initiated to develop over-all Army work measurement systems and staffing guides in order to measure the volume of work turned out by individuals and groups and to compare this volume with the amount of work they should have turned out based on an established standard of performance. When this system is used in conjunction with cost accounting, we will have both the means of comparing volume of work produced and also its costs. When completed, this project will provide still an-

other management tool with which to locate inefficiency and excess costs.

I am sorry I was not in the office when you called. However, I am glad you left the message for me. There is no subject closer to my heart, because upon the economic strength of our Nation depends to a very large degree the future of western civilization.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Secretary of the Army.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS, and to include a statement regarding Billy Graham's revival and a sermon he delivered on yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD in two instances and to include in one extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER to revise and extend his remarks and include excerpts from testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor and also to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include in one an editorial and in the other an article.

Mrs. KEE and to include an address delivered by Mr. H. A. Hayes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include in one extraneous matter.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial appearing in the Toledo Blade.

Mr. ANGELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. BURDICK.
Mr. ADAIR in two instances, to include in one a newspaper article, and in the other a radio speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, and to include an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at a Lincoln Day dinner on Monday, February 11.

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. MERROW and to include a resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Weekly Publishers Association at its annual meeting, January 18.

Mr. WOODRUFF and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include a magazine article.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUTLER and to include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include some material about the State of Iowa.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. DENNY.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) and to include some correspondence.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. FOULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. CANFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include a joint statement by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and himself.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address recently made by the former distinguished Member, and present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. Robert Ramspeck.

Mr. JUDD in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD, and to include extracts from a speech delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and permanent Philippine delegate to the United Nations, before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., on February 14, 1952.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 19, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1159. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$1,053,000 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1160. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, in the amount of \$360,248,306, for the legislative and judicial branches of the Government and for various departments and agencies of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 358); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1161. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of \$1,900,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 359); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1162. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of \$7,700,000 for the Department of Defense for Civil Functions, Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1163. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an estimate for the fiscal year 1953 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1164. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of \$65,000 for

the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1165. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of \$155,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1166. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of \$1,400,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 364); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1167. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting reports of the regular annual meeting, and a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 24-26, 1951, and March 19-20, 1951, respectively, along with recommendations of the conference with respect to legislative proposals (H. Doc. No. 365); to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

1168. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of section 1211 of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950, relative to violations of subsection (h), relative to the appropriation of "Support of United States Prisoners, 1952"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1169. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a letter relative to the case of Salvador Portillo or Salvador Portillo-Moreno or Salvador Moreno, file No. A-7189019 CR 36175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1170. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a letter relative to the case of Jesus Vespero or Jesus Beserra-Hernandez, file No. A-4920577 CR 34721, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1171. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army the Birmingham General Hospital, Van Nuys, Calif."; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5904. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNSON:
H. R. 6658. A bill to incorporate the United Mexican Border Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XCVIII—70

H. R. 6659. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 to provide for the termination of assistance to any nation which does not make a full contribution to the development and maintenance of the defense strength of the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6660. A bill to provide for the granting of financial aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 6661. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 6662. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 6663. A bill to waive the payment of premiums on Government life insurance and national service life insurance policies for certain aged and destitute veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6664. A bill to provide paid-up insurance for certain aged veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6665. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6666. A bill relating to the payment of World War veterans' adjusted compensation in certain cases of the veteran's continued absence from home for a period of 15 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 6667. A bill to liberalize the marriage requirements for compensation and pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6668. A bill to authorize promotions from apprentice to journeyman in the Government service to be made on a permanent basis, to provide credit for promotion and retention purposes for graduate apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6669. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6670. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who serve in the Armed Forces during wartime a 1-year presumption of service connection for ulcerative colitis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6671. A bill to pay tribal funds to issue of members of the Ojibway or Chipewewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 6672. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Arizona control over their tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6673. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 6674. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide that certain members of the National Guard and other Reserve components, who served during World War II, shall be released from active duty upon completing 17 months' active duty after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6675. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa unified school district for use for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 6676. A bill to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6677. A bill to provide for the construction of a chapel at the Fort Snelling National Cemetery, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to provide the power of subpoena in certain investigations relating to improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide that royalties received under certain mineral leases governing submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall be set aside in the Treasury for use as grants-in-aid of medical education and research and the construction and operation of hospitals and other community health facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a continuing investigation and study of the utilization of military manpower and the procurement of services, supplies, and matériel by the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 524. Resolution to amend rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. Res. 525. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication entitled "The Shameful Years" for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 526. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to enact a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress in favor of the enactment of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to lower the premiums on national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 6678. A bill for the relief of Megumi Numajiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6679. A bill for the relief of Lajos Schmidt and his wife, Magda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 6680. A bill for the relief of E. C. Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6681. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6682. A bill for the relief of Brother Julian Chrosciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6683. A bill for the relief of Rosario Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6684. A bill for the relief of Gisa Pavarelli and son, Mauro Pavarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6685. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6686. A bill for the relief of Costas George Kaloyios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6687. A bill for the relief of Winston A. FitzRoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6688. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidecillo-Avecilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6689. A bill for the relief of Anesti N. Baicousheff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

556. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Lt. Frances Y. Slinger Post, No. 313, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America that the Congress of the United States of America pass appropriate legislation to grant to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America a national charter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 51 members of the Mount Pleasant Presbyterian Church of Darlington, Pa., opposing the appointment of a representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

558. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of numerous Minneapolis parents urging passage of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio, television, in magazines, and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

559. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Student Council, Swarthmore College, stating their opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

560. Also, petition of South Miami Townsend Club No. 1, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

561. Also, petition of Orlando Townsend Club No. 2, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, we come conscious that our best contrivings and our wisest plans will stand but as mute monuments of futility in a valley of dry bones unless upon them all Thou shalt breathe the breath of life. If, chastened by Thy immutable laws, a shattered world is at last to leave behind mutual slaughter, exploitation, suspicion, and hatred and march together, no matter how long the way, toward a fairer earth in which nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall learn war any more, then only Thy pillar of cloud and of fire can lead to that golden era.

In this high hour when with all nations we stand in the valley of decision, with the solemn realization that of those to whom much has been given, much shall be required, anxious about the national welfare, we lift our fervent prayer: Send out Thy light and Thy truth; let them lead us from the city of destruction; let them bring us to Thy holy hill of an abundant life and a just peace. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 18, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2131. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii;

H. R. 5598. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah;

H. R. 5633. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5951. An act to add certain federally owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia

was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to continue its session this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF VIOLATION OF PUBLIC LAW 759, RELATING TO APPLICATION FOR SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of section 1211, subsection (h), of Public Law 759, relating to the appropriation for support of United States prisoners to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Cruz Del Toro Composano, Jesus Vespero or Jesus Beserra-Hernandez, and Salvador Portillo or Salvador Portillo-Moreno or Salvador Moreno from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 2, August 1, and August 14, 1951, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Department of the Interior in providing assistance to public-school districts serving areas in which the construction of projects or features of projects, by the Bureau of Reclamation, cast an undue burden upon the facilities of such districts, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, trans-